THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A SYMPOSIUM is often rather a fruitless affair. A few clever men get together and play with a subject, with very little of what the Barthians would call existential thinking. They toss ideas to and fro and generally leave the matter pretty much where they found it.

No such criticism can be made of a symposium on *This War and Christian Ethics* which has just come to hand, edited by Mr. Ashley SAMPSON (Blackwell; 6s. net). Strictly speaking it is not a symposium but a series of twelve very able articles written independently of each other by twelve contributors, drawn from different branches of the Christian Church, who have only this in common that they seek to interpret the Christian ethic in its bearing on the subject of war.

Among the topics treated are the Judgment of God, Prayer in Wartime, The Teaching of the Church, The Conditions of a Just War, A Christian Peace, etc. Every article in the book will well repay reading. It may give some taste of the quality of the whole if we add a few notes on the Theology of Pacifism, a chapter written by the Rev. A. R. Vidler, the Editor of 'Theology.'

It is generally taken for granted that the debate among Christians on the subject of Pacifism has reached a stalemate. The Church of Scotland, for example, spent years in a fresh investigation of the problem, and discovered at the end that the two sides had come no nearer to agreement than when they began. So it is concluded that Christians had better make up their minds, in the meantime at least, to differ with the best grace they can.

Now it is very doubtful if 'theologians ought ever to acquiesce in a disagreement which both touches the roots of their faith and is a confession of their impotence to offer a united interpretation of their faith at a point where it ought to bear with decisive effect on the thought and action of all believers and unbelievers to-day. . . . We need not expect ever to reach exact unanimity as to what we ought to do in this or that concrete situation. . . . But we ought to be able to agree on the general principles upon which we ought to act in any situation; and one of the reasons why the Pacifist controversy has issued in an *impasse* may be that both sides have been more concerned with what we ought to do than with why we ought to do it.'

It will be found on examination that the Christian Pacifist and the Christian non-Pacifist put to themselves two different questions, and by the answers they give to these their conduct is determined. Consequently they never really come to grips. Their arguments against each other have no effect because they seem to miss the point like arrows that fly harmlessly past the target.

The question which the Pacifist asks is, 'What is the ideally right thing to do? What would Christ do? What action is consonant with membership in the Kingdom of God?' He sees, and sees truly, that the answer to this question is that Christ's way of dealing with evil is the way of non-resistance, the way of self-surrender and of taking all the effects of evil upon Himself and of being done to death by them. This for him is decisive and marks out the only way for a Christian to follow, regardless of consequences.

The non-Pacifist on his part cannot get away from the fact that by the Divine ordering of

things he has a citizenship in this world as well as in the Kingdom of God. He feels that there is a question incumbent on him as a Christian to answer: 'What action must he take so that law and order, which are a necessary condition of there being any civilized human society at all, shall be preserved and improved?' He sees, and he thinks that any one must be blind indeed who cannot see, that social order and well-being depend in the last resource on the use of force, and that a nation which abandoned the use of force would be surrendering its national existence. Lawlessness would overrun the earth and sweep the seas. Hence he argues that non-resistance to evil is not a practical way of ordering human existence.

Both Pacifist and non-Pacifist, then, seem to themselves to have an unanswerable case, and both are ready to assume that their view should predominate and override or embrace the other. 'Both are reluctant to admit that there is a fundamental dualism in the moral obligations of a Christian in this world, and are anxious to make out a rationally coherent case for their own position which will eliminate this dualism.' The Pacifist is tempted to infer that the Kingdom of God, the law of pure love, is a simple alternative for political action in this world. 'This is to ignore the fact that, while the Kingdom of God is at work in this world and bears upon historical existence, yet it can never have its *perfect* work in this world; for this world is a fallen world, and its redemption in Christ has not eliminated from it the consequences of the Fall.' The non-Pacifist, on the other hand, realizes that he is a citizen of this world, and that, whatever else God may have in store for him, God must intend him to act as a citizen of this world since He has placed him here; he must never refuse responsibility for the political consequences of his actions. Accordingly 'he is tempted to infer that this must be consistent with the ethic of the gospel, and he is at pains to argue that Jesus approved of coercion by force, that the precept of non-resistance was not intended to be taken literally, or that it was intended only to apply to men in their personal dealings with one another and that it has no relevance to collective action. In this way the ethic of the gospel is deprived of its sting, and is interpreted so as to cohere with the calculations of human prudence.'

The dualism of the Christian man's position must be recognized on both sides, and 'it may be suggested that we shall find a solution, in so far as any solution is possible, by exploring afresh the theology of the relation between grace and Nature, or between the Kingdom of God and historical existence.' No generalized solution is possible, for the problem assumes different forms in different historical situations. There will always be a tension between the claims of the heavenly Kingdom and the natural conditions of our earthly life. 'This tension has to be lived out by every Christian in the decisions which he has to take. In history he is never offered the choice between absolute good and absolute evil. His best action is always tainted with evil, just as his highest knowledge is always tainted with error.' There is only the choice between a better and a worse kind of action, and even when a man conscientiously follows the better course he must beware of claiming that his conscience is clear, forgetting that all men, even in their most righteous moments, are sinners before God. If this dualism of the two citizenships is kept in view then Pacifist and non-Pacifist must realize that 'in making our decisions we have to take into account both our obligations—to the absolute law of love and to the relative law of justice; and that we are evading our problem if we try either to separate them or to achieve a final synthesis between them; each in fact prevents us from the snares implicit in one-sided occupation with the other.'

Miss Dorothy SAYERS produced a very interesting paper for the Malvern Conference. Its title is 'The Church's Responsibility,' and its subject the relation of the Church to the State, or to the social and economic fabric, or to politics, to put it in different ways. The special interest of her essay is that its contentions are quite different from those that are for the moment popular. She points out that for a Christian to detach himself from the social structure is to be less than human, and is also to deny the truth of the Incarnation and the validity of Sacraments.

If the Church is to concern herself with political or economic problems it can only be on the ground of a realistic and sacramental theology of the Incarnation. For this means that the whole of man's humanity, at its most vital, developed and characteristic, is the vehicle of the divine part of his nature; that he cannot grow nearer to God by dissociating himself from his own humanity, or from the rest of humanity; but that, on the contrary, the response of the Spirit to the Father is best expressed in the response of a fully developed and characteristically human society.

But there is a rider to this. A Church which takes up this fully sacramental position must not confine her concern with civilization to the political

and economic aspects of civilization. If she undertakes to sanctify humanity, it must be the *whole* of humanity. She must include within her Sacraments all arts, all letters, all labour, and all learning. For she stands committed to the assertion that all human activity, whether of spirit, mind, or body, is potentially good—not negatively, by repression, but positively, and as an act of worship.

But what actually is the true relation of the Church to this human structure? Is it like that of National Socialism in Germany, which includes everything, dominates, shapes, inspires everything, from the school-primer to Grand Opera, from cosmetics to high finance, from ploughshare to factory? This has been tried, and one lesson at any rate has emerged from the experiment—a Church which identifies herself with any political, economic, or social structure will retain her power only as long as that structure is able to maintain itself against the judgment of its own inherent corruption. After that point is reached, and the inevitable counter-movement has begun, the Church will appear as a reactionary, vainly endeavouring to support the *status quo* against a flood-tide bearing all the world's energy in the opposite direction.

The Church should learn from her Master. It is clear that the gospel is perfectly indifferent to all forms of government. The Kingdom of Heaven is not of this world; and the attempt to yoke it to any form of secular constitution is treason. The resentment felt by the common man against the intrusion of politics into the pulpit is not merely the resentment of the privileged against any disturbance of the *status quo*. He feels obscurely that, although the parson, as a man, has a right to his opinions like anybody else, yet, when he speaks from the pulpit, he is committing not only himself but the Church.

If, then, the Church commits herself, as a Church, to the support of any particular form of political government, and especially if she uses her influence to bring that government into power and keep it there, she will find herself insensibly adopting and maintaining, not only its secular organization, but also its underlying assumption, which may be very strongly in conflict with her theology. It is a commonplace that the Church of Rome was so hypnotized by the menace of Communism that she has been very seriously hampered in dealing with the theological menace of the Nazi religion. 'In the Church of England I observe a section which is so hypnotized by the menace of Nazi-ism that it is strongly inclined to support, and seek the support of, Socialism.'

'If they do this, not as private persons but as Churchmen, they will end by committing the Church to acceptance of a singularly unchristian doctrine—that of the economic basis of society. To such a doctrine nobody ought to commit the Church, whether the form taken by the doctrine is Capitalist, Communist, or Socialist, for the Kingdom of God, not being dependent on any structure of government, need not accept the assumptions underlying that structure.'

'I do not mean,' Miss SAYERS writes, 'that the Church must be uninterested in the social, political, and moral sphere of the law, but that she must be disinterested.' There is a vast difference between these two words. I believe the Church has failed again and again by identifying herself both with the law and with the code of the law; and that she will fail whenever she identifies herself with the systems and moralities which are of the nature of law. There are difficulties connected with this, but the Church believes that God was also a man. And this particular Man it has never been possible to identify with any social, political, or economic system, or with any moral code. And the Church can only order the affairs of the world when, and so long as, she is not involved in or identified with them.

The Rev. E. G. RUPP'S *Is this a Christian Country?* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net) is No. 12 in the topical series of 'Christian News-Letter Books,' which is intended to assist thought upon the relation of the Christian faith to present problems. It has been written with the conviction that a deep need of our time is 'a sane, reasoned, and Christian patriotism to replace an idealism which has broken down.'

The book is vigorous and pointed in style. It contains chapters on 'Liberty' and 'Democracy' in their relation to English history and the Christian faith. These studies in the Christian past are followed by chapters on 'Is this a Pagan Country?' and 'Converting the Nation.' Then the writer turns from the present to the future, giving chapters on 'National Vocation' and 'A Christian Country.'

The last-named chapter opens with these words: 'A generation was born during the years 1914–18, and most of its life has been spanned by what deserves to be called the Great Armistice. Those war years were years of childhood: they left dim memories of the ambulance lines at Charing Cross, of soldiers in hospital blue, of guns coughing

in the night, of maps in newspapers, of flags bought and waved on the first Armistice Day—memories all of them colourful, and most of them faintly exciting.'

It continues, 'More important was the mental atmosphere into which these children grew and were educated. They were encouraged to think that war was done with, that world disarmament would soon be accomplished and that the "smaller, narrower, nationalisms" were to be superseded by the "wider, broader, internationalism" of which the League of Nations would be the focus and the frame.'

It is regarded by the writer as 'sinister' that many of the prophets of these ideas—H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Bertrand Russell—were public antagonists of the Christian Church, and 'ominous' that the most distinguished academic figure in the League of Nations Union, Gilbert Murray, was the doyen of English rationalism. But was it really sinister or ominous, and can Gilbert Murray be properly described as 'the doyen of English rationalism'?

We are, however, with the writer when he speaks of the 'genuine bewilderment' which the present war has brought to the generation born during the last war. They must feel that, in the language of the Maid, their voices have deceived them. They must be tempted to bitterness or cynicism as they look upon the wreckage of their fair hopes. The writer does well to offer for their consideration the programme of a 'Christian country' as the true promise of better things to come.

Let us have done, he says, with the grandiose visions for the 'New World Order' in the 'New Age' as those are sponsored by 'our internationalist sceptics,' and let us begin with Christian faith and Christian principles. Therein is a sufficient programme for any one age. We must seek so to restore Christian convictions that the Christian ideas of one generation become the springs of habitual action in the next, while all the time the Church is a fountain of spiritual life in the midst of the nation. 'There is no guarantee for any generation that the barbaric floods may not come in, if the dykes go unwatched.'

The Christian voices of our English past might have warned us that 'a war to end war' could never absolve future generations from making and keeping their own peace; and that if patriotism is not enough (as surely it is not), an internationalism founded not on history but on abstract ideals might be much more insufficient. If a nation should dare to affirm with the late Lord Lothian that 'the Sermon on the Mount is in the long run stronger than Hitler's propaganda or Goering's bombs,' it might go on to accept the task therein implied, of seeking to become a Christian country.

The chapter concludes: 'If love is better than hate, justice than unrighteousness, trust than fear, peace than war, truth than lies, pity than cruelty, mercy than revenge, then those ranged on the more excellent way are invulnerable, for with them is the universe itself, the love which moves the sun and the other planets. The nation which obeyed these things would possess something of which nobody could dispossess her, which she would hold even in defeat, but which in victory she might hope to share with all mankind. That is a good hope, even for dark days and amid deep waters.'

The Cry of Dereliction.

By the Reverend W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., Woodstock.

The cry of Jesus on the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mk 15^{34}, Mt 27^{46}, Ps 22^{1}) has commonly been regarded as marking the centre of His suffering and the culmination of His atoning work. He felt the penalty or consequence of sin in Himself, to be cut off from the presence of His Father. Of the more recent writers on the subject, only Dr. Dale regards Jesus as actually punished by the Father; but few agree with Dr. M'Leod Campbell that the consciousness of unity with the Father remained unbroken. Did Jesus think it was broken? If so, was He right or wrong? Four inquiries are involved in this question, critical, exegetical, psychological, and theological. Each needs a brief consideration.

1. *Critical.* Mark's transliteration, it is generally agreed, represents the Aramaic, Matthew's the Hebrew. The verb (in both Gospels) is not that which is found in the Massoretic text, but in the Targums (Strack-Billerbeck, i. 1042). Which language would Jesus have been likely to use? We can hardly tell; Dr. C. H. Turner (*The Gospel according to Saint Mark, ad loc.*) decides for the Matthean form. If Jesus used Aramaic the word could not have been confused with Elijah (Mk 15^{35}, Mt 27^{47}). For the account of the hours spent on the Cross, Matthew would seem superior to Mark. It may however be argued that the Marcan form represents the Hebrew *Elohai*, as against the form *Eli* given in the Massoretic text. D and *vet. lat.* (in Mark, not Matthew) give for 'forsaken,' 'reproached.' Dr. Turner accepts this on the ground, Schmiedel-like, that no Christian would have invented it. Yet, what if Jesus had in mind Ps $69^{9.\ 19f.}$ (cf. Ro 15^{8}) and Is 53^{3}? K gives *helion* for *elian*, which the Roman soldiers might have mistaken for their own popular deity, the sun-god (Helios), imagining that the agonized figure was calling on him; hence, the sponge offered, to give the sun a chance to come out and save him. It may even be that the cry of Jesus was simply *Eli, eli*; these two words would easily be expanded into the first verse of a Psalm recognized in the Early Church as Messianic (cf. *vv.*$^{16ff.}$). Would the reporter of the scene be himself in a position to give an accurate rendering of all that took place in the confusion and noise and darkness? While then the balance of probability is that Jesus quoted Ps 22, we cannot be sure of what He actually said. This leads us to the second or exegetical question. What lies behind the words?

2. *Exegetical.* Ps 22 begins with the poignant complaint, 'why hast thou left me alone or in the lurch?' and ends with the confident assertion of God's salvation and the Psalmist's resolve to make it known to his people and to the future. In fact, the Psalmist discovers that he has not been forsaken at all. The change of attitude (beginning at *v.*^{22}) is so marked that some have found there the beginning, not of a fresh section, but of a fresh psalm. This has met with little favour; and the possibility would certainly not be in the mind of any contemporary Jewish reader of the O.T. Nor is it any great matter whether the 'I' of the Psalm be interpreted as of the community (so Baethgen), or some individual sufferer (so Gunkel). What is important, if the Psalm is to be considered as a unity, is the nature of the sufferer's complaint. It is threefold; he is left alone, by his friends, and by God; in the midst of relentless enemies (*vv.*$^{1.\ 12}$), he is subjected to their contempt and threats (*vv.*$^{6.\ 12}$); and he is consumed with fever ($^{14f.}$). Some verses directly suggest the suffering Servant of Is 50, 53 ($^{6.\ 12.\ 15}$); others, incidents of the Crucifixion ($^{16.\ 18}$); but the reading in the last clause of ^{16} ('they pierced') is highly uncertain.

The sufferer does not, however, complain of the burden of sin, another's or his own. Nor is there suspicion that the cause of his being forsaken is any unfaithfulness or disobedience; his tone is in entire contrast to that of Ps 51. On the contrary, he protests his abiding trust in God, and God's continued protection to him and to the whole nation ($^{3ff.\ 10}$). He knows nothing of the desperate cry of Job, 'I have not done wrong; why does God treat me as if I had?' God may seem to have forsaken him; he has not forsaken God ($^{3.\ 9f.\ 19}$); while the second part is a continuous song of confidence ('when I cried unto Him, He heard').

Had Jesus, then, the whole Psalm in mind, or only the first verse? If the former, the difficulties already referred to disappear; He has before Him the thought of triumph over weakness, of a champion who comes to rescue a faithful servant ringed about by foes; but He has not before Him the thought of sin, or, in the semi-technical sense, of dereliction. As the late Dr. Goudge wrote (*New Comm. on Holy Scripture*, N.T., 202): 'we cannot fathom the meaning of these words on our Lord's lips; but, coming as they do from Ps 22, we should note their original meaning. There is no suggestion of spiritual dereliction.' Indeed, the ground is cut from under Schmiedel; for if our Lord did not quote the Psalm, any Jewish Christian who knew his Scriptures would feel the appropriateness if He had done so.

Nor is it easy to suppose that even in those terrible hours, if our Lord had recollected the opening of the Psalm, the rest of it could have been forgotten or left out of account. He was not in the habit (however the greatest of His apostles may have treated the Scriptures; cf. 1 Co 9^{9}, Gal 3^{13}) of extracting verses from their context. He had studied the Scripture with the deepest reverence. We have the abundant evidence of the influence of the Servant Songs on His consciousness of His mission. His forecasts of His death were regularly joined to His rising again on the third day, 'according to the Scriptures.'[1] We cannot suppose that Psalm 22 had been neglected, with its message of weakness and isolation passing into magnificent vindication and the proclamation of God's grace to all the world. But while He foretold His death in detail, He never predicted anything corresponding to spiritual dereliction; there is nothing

[1] Mt 16^{21} 17^{23} 20^{19}, Mk 9^{31} 10^{34}, Lk 9^{22} 13^{32} 24^{46}, Jn 20^{9}.

to suggest that this was in His mind, even in Gethsemane. On the contrary, in the first three Gospels, as in the fourth, He is absolutely sure of His unbroken communion with God. And if, in that hour of darkness, He suddenly felt that God had deserted Him, and used these familiar words to express His misery, it could only be because His abiding consciousness of His Father and of Himself had been suddenly swept away.

3. *Psychological.* Let us however assume that only the first words of the Psalm were in our Lord's mind; we now go on in the next place to ask, how far psychological analysis can cast any light on this alleged period of utter despair. There will be some who will deprecate such a question. 'We cannot argue from any human experience,' they will say, 'to the mystery of our Lord's sufferings.' True, we cannot hope to fathom the experience of one who spoke and thought as no man had ever done before; but against such obscurantism we must set the clearness and intelligibility of His whole converse. He spoke our language; He was moved as we are moved. He had taken our nature upon Him.

In the first place, this experience must have been brief; perhaps only momentary. The agonized mood of Gethsemane passed with the approach of the traitor; and nothing is more remarkable throughout the whole subsequent narrative than Jesus' calm and absolute self-command; not least on the Cross, which veritably became His throne. The Marcan narrative, indeed, with its two cries, has been read as if it were a record of failure, and Jesus died in despair; but this is contradicted by both John and Luke, and by the comment of the centurion, whether in the Marcan or the Lucan form; and the second of the cries may have been a shout of victory, like that represented by the Hebrew root *ranan*, which generally expresses joy, though occasionally grief. Either we must jettison six out of the seven words on the Cross, or the mood of despair, ending as it does with another quotation from a Psalm (31^5), must have been very short-lived.

This could not be said to be impossible; but similar periods of desolation have usually lasted much longer—as in the case of John Bunyan or John Nelson. But our Lord's experience, whatever it was, must be considered in connexion with what He and He alone was accomplishing. He 'bore our griefs, our sins.' Does this necessitate, or suggest, a period—if only a moment—of dereliction? We are not left wholly without analogies. We have the story of the Prophet Hosea and his search for his erring wife. And, following the suggestions of Moberly, we can imagine a friend or a brother pursuing a wanderer into the depths of degradation, to bring him back to the life he had deserted. He would feel the sinner's pain and misery in the lair where he was at last run to earth; he would feel the ridicule and contempt which would watch his descent into that disgusting environment; he would feel, far more deeply than the sinner, the horror and the bondage of the sin which had brought him there. Any one who has tried to rescue a drunkard will understand this. But would he look on himself as having sinned? Surely not. Contact with sin, as men have said who have heard confessions of degrading vice, might make him physically sick. But sympathy is not loss of self-identity or self-direction. The very fact that he felt sin as sin and filth as filth would mean that his heart's citadel was untouched.[1]

But Christ, it will be urged, was one with man as no individual human being could be. There is no analogy from which we can argue to Him. That is to turn from the guidance of psychology. Yet if we are to regard Christ as so entirely one with man that, paradoxically, a knowledge of the working of the mind of man tells us nothing of the working of Christ's mind, we must pass to the theological aspect of the problem. Still, however ruthlessly we push aside what we know of human mind and character,[2] we cannot but question the significance of a fleeting experience, however poignant, which contradicted the whole tenor of the life of our Lord, as all admit, and revealed, at one tense moment, a real disintegration. Why did human sin fail to produce this effect on Him before? Had its true horror been hidden from His all-seeing eye till then? And would the sacrifice of obedience have been more complete if this crowning bitterness had not been so mercifully transient?

4. *Theological.* The Christian Church has formulated no orthodox doctrine of the Atonement; because, as it would seem, there is no sufficient basis for one in the New Testament. There is nothing corresponding to the great Nicene affirmation that Christ was not only complete man—but certainly not man in the completeness of man's weakness and alienation from God; He was also one with God. He was the Mediator; so that if either end of the chain is cut, mediation is no more. But we can make certain statements

[1] Dr. Moberly (*Atonement and Personality*) has urged the conception of 'vicarious penitence.' But, as his son, Sir W. H. Moberly, has pointed out (*Foundations*, 308 ff.), 'I may feel sorrow, but I cannot intelligibly feel penitence for the sin of another in which I have had no hand and which I could not have prevented. . . .' What destroys the 'sin-taste' in the sinner is 'the shame which mere knowledge of our sins produces in those who love us.'

[2] 'Character is shown not so much at a single dramatic moment, but is continuous throughout life,' W. H. Moberly, *op. cit.*

on which the New Testament leaves us in no doubt.

(1) The purpose of Christ's coming into the world was the reconciliation of men, as sinners, to God. This reconciliation is the work of the Father Himself, through the Son; the Son is one with the Father, this oneness resting on His knowledge of His Father, His obedience[1] to His Father, and His co-operation with His Father; all these, complete and perfect and unbroken.

(2) Hence, however, the Son in the course of His obedience may suffer, it is as inconceivable as it is unscriptural to think of Him as being punished. He dies on our behalf; He is not punished instead of us. In the New Testament only two expressions seem to make against this; the (to English readers) curious phrase, 'God made Him sin on our behalf' (2 Co 5^{21}; see below) and the rhetorical reference to the Mosaic curse on an impaled man (Gal 3^{13}, where St. Paul quotes Dt 21^{23} but does not allow himself to quote in full).

(3) Further, if Christ is the instrument[2] through which God reconciles sinners to Himself, it is through Him that we become children of the Heavenly Father; we are 'credited with righteousness'; not, that is to say, with the performance of moral or ritual acts really left undone; but with a filial attitude which it is now in our power to assume and manifest.[3]

(4) Jesus Himself gave us no rationale of the Atonement. He spoke of His death as a ransom; but this is a metaphor which breaks down the moment we ask to whom the ransom is paid. When He foretold His death,[4] with which He does not seem to have connected any direct mention of human sin, His words rule out any suggestion of what would even otherwise be barely conceivable, spiritual death or cutting off from God; nor does He make any prediction of spiritual isolation. The Cross means shame, scandal, and reproach.[5] Men may turn their eyes from Him as He hangs there; but God does not.

We must therefore admit that the view which finds in the opening words of Ps 22 the culmination of our Lord's atoning work, as being the expression of complete desolation, has little or nothing in the New Testament, or in our Lord's own expectation,[6] to support it, save by the aid of rather dubious exegesis. Then can it be maintained from a theologian's angle of approach?

Christ's part in the work of reconciliation was His obedience and co-operation, seen perfectly in Gethsemane. Suffering was accidental, though unavoidable. Obedience and co-operation were essential. If on the other hand we are to find the supreme moment of Christ's work in some moment when He was no longer conscious of His Father's presence, when He felt Himself deserted and when therefore co-operation was impossible, such a moment would not be the culmination but the contradiction of all that had gone before, and of all that was to come.

'But it was the Father's will.' How do we know this? We cannot even conclude it from Is 53 (e.g. *v.*[10]). What we do know is that everywhere else God's will is the reverse. What is there in the particular torture (for torture it would surely be, both to cause and to suffer) which, withheld save for those few moments, gives, as it is alleged, the one necessary element to His work?

There is, however, the further dilemma. If Jesus felt that His Father deserted Him, was He right or wrong? Those who have held that it was the purpose of the Father to punish the Son, that is, to inflict pain on Him for its own sake, will hold that He was right; that God did treat Jesus as if He were a lost soul. But such a view is now generally repudiated; could even God treat the sinless Jesus as if He were a lost soul, unless we grant with Duns Scotus that for God all things are possible, even turning A into its contradictory not-A. The suggestion that the Father could actually turn away from His Son can only be met by the Pauline 'God forbid!'

Then, was our Lord wrong? He must have been. That is to say, at the very moment when He was accomplishing the purpose formed from the foundation of the world, He was deceived; He surrendered His deepest conviction; and the Father, if He did not cause this tragedy, must have permitted it. In spite of all the pathos of its emotional appeal, this strikes at the very heart of our confidence in Christ as the revelation, the instrument, of the Father's good pleasure. If He was wrong then, how do we know that He was right at other times? If He was merely human then, how can we be sure of His divinity? The thing does not, as we say, make sense. It might

[1] Obedience is relative to the task imposed on it. Christ did not simply offer to His Father, as a sacrifice, a diffused habit of obedience, but His performance of the 'work' for which He had been sent into the world.

[2] This is what seems to be suggested by the constant use of *dia* with the genitive.

[3] Righteousness to the Hebrew mind is never the mere right performance of acts demanded by a moral or legal code; it always involves being on right terms with a person, man or God.

[4] See above, *loc. cit.*

[5] Cf. Mk 10^{34}, 1 Co 1^{23}, He 12^{2}, Is 53^{3}; nor ought we to forget Mt 5^{11}, Lk 6^{22}, Mk 13^{13}.

[6] Cf. Lidgett, *Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, 277.

serve the docetics, or the Arians; but what of Nicaea?

Perhaps we may find a suggestion of the truth in the strange phrase already quoted, 'God made Him to be sin on our behalf,' immediately followed by the words 'that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.' The substitution of noun for adjective in the predicate is a not unfamiliar Hebraism (cf. Ps 109[4], lit., 'but I for my part am—prayer'[1]). The Apostle means that the Father caused His Son to enter right into the experience of being in the wrong with God, alienated from God, though all the while He knew no sin, no alienation; in order that we might enter as fully into the experience of being right with God. But such an imaginative *Einfühlung* does not imply actual dereliction, or indeed any break in the abiding union between the two. As well suppose that if a lover, sure of the tie which bound him to his beloved, were to say 'how terrible if we were to quarrel, as others have done,' they would thereby, even for a moment, be divided. What Christ bore for us, He bore voluntarily, with that free will which moved in complete harmony with His Father. Like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior, He 'sees what He foresaw.'

So profound a question of interpretation is not to be disposed of within the bounds of a single article. But enough has perhaps been said to show the very serious issues involved.

'O love of God! O sin of Man!'

It would ill become any Christian theologian to say a word to lessen the significance and the mystery of this pregnant line. 'He is so closely one with the alienated that He experiences their alienation.'[2] But it is their alienation; not His. We do not deepen the horror of man's sin by supposing that Christ could, even for a moment, think Himself to be a sinner, nor do we pay honour to God's love when we imagine that, even for a moment, He shut it off from His Son. Christ did not save mankind by what He felt, but by what He did. Nor did He conquer sin by coming, like Bunyan's Pilgrim, within an ace of being defeated by it. With the thought of another solitary sufferer in His mind, who had won through, He tracked His grisly foe to its furthest and foulest lair. Endurance and action were one. Victory did not come because, reduced to the last gasp, He gave up, in that hour of great darkness, His faith in God's presence; but because, as Aulén has reminded us, 'on the cross, having put off from Himself the principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.' Thus did the King of Glory overcome the sharpness of Death.

[1] Cf. Tennyson's phrase, 'the lark becomes a sightless song.'

[2] Cf. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, 254.

Literature.

JESUS AND THE KINGDOM.

Dr. Cecil John Cadoux, Vice-Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, has completed a large task with the publication of his recent work on *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net). The work is sub-entitled, 'A Constructive Re-examination of the Eschatological Teaching in the Synoptic Gospels'; and it more than justifies its sub-title. For the constructions are not only consequent upon a direct study of the various texts, but also upon a critical consideration of recent constructive efforts.

The work consists of four main parts. The first is a study of Jesus as 'the Bringer of the Kingdom of God.' In this part special consideration is given to His various 'titles.' The second part discusses 'the Nature and Presence of the Kingdom of God'; the third, 'the Future of the Kingdom as first envisaged'; and the fourth, 'the Future of the Kingdom as last envisaged.'

A point of special interest in the First Part is the exposition of the title 'Son of Man' as not only Jesus' occasional self-designation, but a name for the holy community He desired to gather round Him. As readers of Dr. Cadoux's writings would anticipate, he represents Jesus in the Second Part as declaring the doctrine of 'non-resistance to evil' with a civic or corporate reference; Jesus is prescribing the right conduct for His hearers in their relations with Gentiles or Herodian Jews, especially those who belonged either to the Roman or to the Herodian government. In laying down the distinction stated in the Third and Fourth Parts between the first and the last envisagement of the future of the Kingdom, Dr. Cadoux raises for himself many critical difficulties, but secures the advantage of a more or less clear division of material.

Wide and vigilant reading and careful documenting serve to make this a useful book of reference for the student of the Synoptic Gospels. Its

usefulness is enhanced by its timeliness. We reckoned long ago with the Nineteenth-Century Liberalism and the Twentieth-Century Eschatologism, but many are inquiring as to the bearing of the Form-Criticism and the Barthian Theology upon the problem of the exposition of the life of the historical Jesus. It is to be observed that Dr. Cadoux refuses to be stampeded by literary scepticism into a flight from historicism. He also refuses to believe that if one stands his ground he must identify himself with doctrinal neo-conservatism. He is confident that the attempt to expound the historic mission of Jesus in the light of modern study is well worth while. Many are in sympathy with the 'Liberal' (may it not be distinguished from 'Liberalist'?) standpoint he adopts, and will be accordingly all the more grateful to him for the notable achievement which this book represents. W. FULTON.

WHAT MEAN THESE STONES?

In the book with this title (American Schools of Oriental Research; $2.50), by Millar Burrows, Ph.D., Winkly Professor of Biblical Theology in Yale University, the significance of archæology for Biblical studies is discussed and treated in a thoroughly scientific and yet popular way. The author, well known for his association with archæological enterprises in Palestine and Mesopotamia, deals with the varied interests of the Bible, such as its text and languages, its topography and chronology, its political and cultural conditions, its material and secular background, and its religious and ethical contents. He analyses the contributions which all these matters, from the archæological point of view, make to Biblical studies and endeavours to determine their actual bearing on the value and significance of the Bible. In a closing chapter he gives numerous archæological results which explain or illustrate Bible texts, or which correct these where the writers have been at fault. From the rapidly increasing amount of material now available, he has made an excellent representative selection, and on the whole has applied it fairly, accurately, and with extreme caution far removed from the reckless confidence of some writers. As the book comes from the American Schools of Oriental Research and has been revised by Professor W. F. Albright, Professor E. A. Speiser, and others, it confines its references almost entirely to the publications of these Schools, seeing that such publications are more readily accessible to American readers. It is questionable, however, whether this procedure is wise, considering the vast and equally authoritative material published by British scholars, which ought to be known in America.

The book is naturally full of debatable matters, on which many outstanding scholars will differ from the author. The date of the Exodus, for instance, which finds a prominent place in the volume, is resolved in favour of the view recently adopted by Albright, who now places the Fall of Jericho some time between 1375 and 1300 B.C., and the Exodus about 1290 B.C., and Joshua's invasion of Canaan about 1230 B.C., when such cities as Bethel, Lachish, and Debir appear to have been burned. Such a theory, it need hardly be said, presents insuperable difficulties. It has to assume a 'pre-Israelite' invasion of Canaan by the Hebrews (Ḫabiru) in the Amarna Age, and it is too late even for this; it makes the Israelites leave Egypt during the early reign of Rameses II. (*c.* 1300–1233 B.C.), a most unlikely enterprise on their part, considering the nature of this Pharaoh; and it assumes that the destruction of the cities referred to about 1230 B.C. was the work of the invading Hebrews, whereas it was undoubtedly due, as the excavators of Lachish themselves suggest (*Lachish II.*, p. 23), to Merenptah's Raid which we know took place about 1230 or 1229 B.C., and which was far more widespread and serious than is generally realized. The Lachish Letters are also discussed; and while Torczyner's idea that they have to do with the prophet Uriah is rightly dismissed, the reviewer's theory that the prophet referred to is probably Jeremiah is set aside, in spite of the striking similarity between the text of Letter VI. 4–7 and that of Jer 38^4 which is noticeable in several points.

Numerous other criticisms of the volume might be offered, but its excellencies far outweigh any such comments. It puts Biblical archæology in a true light, gives innumerable new facts, is clearly written and beautifully illustrated, and deserves a welcome place in every Biblical student's library. The author, who writes from a Liberal Protestant's point of view, truly remarks that 'no mechanical idea of inspiration . . . can stand in the face of the fact of archæology.' The writers of the Bible, in fact, used the myths and legends, laws and institutions, which they found at hand, while at the same time transforming them and giving them new meaning. J. W. JACK.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS.

Malvern, 1941: The Life of the Church and the Order of Society. Being the Proceedings of the Archbishop of York's Conference (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). The aim of this notable Conference was 'to consider how far the Christian faith and principles based upon it afford guidance for action in the world to-day.' The most interesting criticism of its proceedings has come from Mr. Middleton Murry (who took a prominent part in them) who says the Conference was all talk and ended in talk. What he and Mr. Kenneth Graham and Sir Richard Acland wanted was action. To Mr. Ingram, Socialism is a *religious* issue. Christianity demands it, and therefore the Church should proclaim it. To him private profit is the evil. To Sir Richard private ownership is the stumbling-block 'which is making it harder for us to advance towards the Kingdom of God on earth.' This is surely a departure from the older Socialism, for (if I remember aright) Mr. Ramsay Macdonald in his excellent book, *Socialism*, said that Socialists did not object to private property. Their complaint was that there was not enough of it. There was too much in too few hands.

These three contributors may be said to constitute the left-wing of the Conference. And the issue between them and Miss Sayers (another speaker) is clear cut: Is the duty of the Church to commit herself to a definite advocacy of a Socialist State? The Archbishop in his introduction answers the question by anticipation. He says: 'The Church itself has the responsibility of proclaiming the gospel in its purity but also in its fulness, and of urging all Christians to take it as the inspiration and guide of all thought and conduct, personal and political alike. But that is the limit of the Church's proper sphere of action. What lies beyond this is the task of individual Christians in the discharge of the obligation laid upon them by the Church.' 'Malvern,' however, can go further than this. It is there to help intelligent Christians to think out the implications of fundamental Christian principles in relation to contemporary needs. In other words, it goes half-way towards action. It will help the more or less impotent churchman into the pool.

There are two criticisms of 'Malvern' which offer themselves inevitably. The reader of these able papers asks himself: 'Well, what was the upshot? What came of all this admirable talk? What did the Conference *decide*?' only to be solemnly informed that the findings are published elsewhere, because it was thought that they might tend 'to draw attention to themselves and away from the arguments developed in the papers'! This is a statement which may be left without comment. The other reflection suggested by these essays is that if they are to reach the 'public' they will have to be translated into simpler terms. Perhaps they are not intended for the simpler Christian, but only for those who are possible leaders. But we may hope that some of the wisdom spread out so lavishly here may filter down to the common man. For there is a good deal of wisdom to be found in these pages. At any rate the situation to-day is clearly expounded and its challenge to the Church is put cogently and nakedly. There must be for the many a new world of opportunity and happiness after the war. What is the Church's duty in the making of this world? 'Malvern' will help the thoughtful Christian to answer that question.

F. J. Rae.

Bible Studies and Jewish Ideals, by Mr. Joseph Porton (Introduction and Notes by Professor Samuel Krauss and Foreword by Professor Selig Brodetsky), is the title given by the author to a collection of short articles on a number of different subjects, mostly of interest only to Jews (The 'Auto' Press, Leeds; 7s. 6d. net). The writer makes no claim to scholarship or expert knowledge, though he is clearly a man of deep feeling and anxious to promote the interests of true religion. It is a little surprising to find the names of Professors Krauss and Brodetsky associated in any way with the work, or to explain the complimentary terms of a letter from the former which is included towards the end of the volume.

No. XI. of 'Studies and Documents,' edited by Kirsopp Lake, D.Litt., Ph.D., and Silva Lake, Ph.D. (Christophers; 15s. net), is of special interest and importance. It is entitled *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group) the Text according to Mark with a Collection of Codex 28 of the Gospels*, and is by the Editors. It is frankly a work for the expert and those who have to teach advanced students of the Text of the New Testament. All such will find it of great value. The importance of the Ferrar Group has been increasingly recognized in recent years. Here we have a very interesting account of the progress of investigation in which the learned authors themselves have played a notable part.

The Crowns of Jesus (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) is the somewhat enigmatic title of a little book by the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, C.H., D.D. The author had regarded his writing days as done, when, as he says in the Preface, 'the title and contents of this volume suddenly and unexpectedly came to me, accompanied by a constraining call to write them.' The 'crowns of Jesus' here treated of are His Religion, Redemption, Communion, Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. The whole of the little book, which the veteran preacher looks upon as his last, is offered as 'a tribute of devotion to our blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.'

Champion of the Outcaste, by Miss Eileen Crowley (Highway Press; 1s. 6d. net), gives a short sketch of the career, all too brief, of Lester Hooper who went out as a C.M.S. missionary to Travancore and became the founder of a special mission to the outcastes. The picture of him given here, if not particularly vivid, is drawn with warm affection and admiration. We get the impression of a tall, companionable, tumultuous fellow, too full of enthusiasm to take care of himself, and running his race with swiftness to a speedy close. It is a stimulating narrative.

In *The Battle of World Evangelisation* the Rev. A. T. Houghton, M.A. (Assistant Bishop-Designate of Rangoon), has treated his subject in an interesting and arresting way (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 4d.). Using the analogy of the world-war he deals with such topics as Universal Front-Line Warfare, the Danger of Fifth-Columnists, Lines of Communication, and the Importance of Munitions. He admits that 'the phraseology may well be out of date in a short space of time,' but meanwhile it is here used to very good purpose and is full of suggestion and stimulus.

In *The Vocation of England*, by Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt and Mr. J. V. Langmead Casserley (Longmans; 5s. net), we have the precipitate of a series of discussions at a Summer School held

under the auspices of the Church Union School of Sociology. The subject of the Conference was 'The English Situation,' and the conviction animating it was that England has a peculiar responsibility and opportunity in the context of to-day. The two authors were charged with the task of presenting the substance of the discussions to a wider audience. This book is the result, and it may be said to contain a plea which is both conservative and revolutionary—conservative because the writers believe strongly in the 'English Tradition,' and revolutionary because they deplore the damage which is being done to it by 'an abominably unjust and insanely ridiculous economic system.' It should be explained that 'England' is really England and not Britain, and the survey of the book is of the whole life and structure of the land, its economic and religious and social and moral factors. There is everywhere in the book a robust faith in the leadership of England in the making of a new era, and especially (with all its faults) of the English Church, on which there is a full and critical and hopeful chapter.

Emeritus Professor James Mackinnon, D.D., D.Th., has at long last given us the fourth instalment of his *History of Modern Liberty* (Longmans; 16s. net). The preceding volume appeared as long ago as 1908. Dr. Mackinnon explains that in his appointment to the Chair of Ecclesiastical History in Edinburgh he had to devote himself to that specific branch of History. No doubt that excuse must be accepted; only one wonders why a work so intimately connected as this volume with ecclesiastical history should have been laid aside, while the author found time to publish while he occupied the Chair two important historical works on subjects remote from Church History.

That apart, those who possess the three preceding volumes on Liberty will welcome this addition. It brings the account down to a far better stopping-place than volume III. did. In fact this volume might be called part II. of the third volume, covering as it does the period 1647–89.

Like all Dr. Mackinnon's work this book is characterized by scholarship and sound historical judgment. A great number of interesting characters pass in review and the author's verdict on each and all is eminently fair. He does not fail to point out in the text what parallels may be found in the French Revolution or, in his Preface, what parallels may be found between the struggle of the seventeenth century and that in which we are now engaged.

A series of lessons for senior pupils, between twelve and fourteen years of age, has been written by Miss Elsie E. Boden, B.A., N.F.U., *Follow the Christ* (Lutterworth Press; 5s. net). The title indicates the line the author has taken. Under such rubrics as Leadership, Ambition, Temptation, Prayer, and many others, the pupils' minds are led through an intelligent course of thought which always has two aims in view, conduct and devotion. One of the chief purposes of the lessons is to train young people in habits of prayer and in ability to pray. But of course the main 'objective,' to use Miss Boden's word, is to set before youth Jesus as the ideal leader, guide, and friend. Both these purposes are successfully pursued in these sound and helpful lessons.

In Six Days, by Mr. A. C. Buchanan (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), contains 'meditations for Lent or other times.' These meditations deal with everything connected with the Passion of our Lord—the places, the instruments of the Passion, the judges of Jesus, and other matters. They are very impressive. No one could read this book, as it should be read, slowly and devoutly, without being deeply moved. It is an ideal companion for Lent. There is a spirit in the thoughts and their expression that takes one deep into the secret of a living faith. Some of the prayers are singularly beautiful in their simplicity and in their language. This is a book to be strongly commended for its spiritual guidance.

A very frank, able, and far-reaching statement on the need of reform in the Church is published under the title of *Church Reform*, by P.E.P. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net). The chapters appeared in 'The Church Times,' which gives them a certain *cachet*. The main objective is to arouse the attention of Churchmen to the seriousness of the various hindrances that impair the working efficiency of the Church of England. The writer advocates a reorganization of ecclesiastical machinery and also a change of spirit in the clergy who operate it. Committees and commissions seem to produce no result. The evils remain and little is done to remedy them. The conscience of the people needs to be enlightened and aroused. Unless this is accomplished the Church will be very unfit to take its part in leading the country to a better way of life. It should be added that the writer is as intelligent as he is bold, and his criticism spares none. The closing chapter on 'The Defects of the Clergy' is not pleasant reading, but it is perhaps as much needed as any other.

A modest pamphlet contains a restatement of the Christian faith by Free Churchmen. It is called *A Modern Churchman's Manual*, and is compiled by the Rev. H. Bulcock, M.A., B.D., President of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen (published by the Union of Modern Free Churchmen; 6d.). Mr. Bulcock goes over the whole ground, dealing with every Christian doctrine, and 're-stating' it in accordance with modern knowledge. He claims that the essential truth of every one is preserved, even of such doctrines as the Trinity and the Incarnation. The book is worth reading even if we know what to expect under each head. It is all well done, and will perhaps bring some comfort to the perplexed.

Reconstruction Problems.

V. The New Order: Notes on 'The Human Element.'

By the Reverend Canon T. Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Rector of Birmingham, Chaplain to the King.

There are preliminary difficulties which beset the discussion of the New Order which receive scant attention. I desire to draw the attention of readers to some of them, lest the conclusions which we seek to draw should be invalidated by their neglect.

In the first place, where shall we find the starting-point of the New Order? Is it beginning now—forming itself silently through the disappearance of capital and through other social changes which affect property and industrial resources, and developing inexorably along Marxian lines? Or is it a planned structure which we shall begin to build after the war is over? In that case it is pertinent to observe that we do not know how the war will end. It is usually taken for granted, by the planners, that the war will come to a sharp and decisive end like the last one. But there is much to suggest that, in the era of cataclysm and crisis which has come upon the world, there may be no such clearly defined transition. It is significant that the change-over from peace to war, which has now been going on for many years, has taken place according to a new technique. Declarations of war are out of favour except with old-fashioned nations like ourselves. Japan prefers an 'incident' which may last a generation. Italy 'enters' the war like a ship which is being launched. She descends the slipway, plunges into her native element and there she is—such is the Fascist way of looking at the business. As for Germany, it is hard to say whether she really understands the meaning of peace except as an opportunity for preparing for war. She is so accustomed to being at war all the time, whether her unfortunate neighbours are aware of it or not, that she did not seem to resent over much America taking a leaf out of her book, and carrying on an undeclared war against her while nominally at peace. It is all very confusing at this end of the crisis and it may be at the other end as well.

I remember on one occasion the Archbishop of York being pressed in debate to say where the Church began and where it ended—in other words, to define who were in it and who were not. He refused to be drawn, and took refuge in an analogy by comparing the Church to a ray of light and reminding his audience that you cannot tell exactly where the ray of light fades into the darkness. We may find ourselves in a somewhat similar position, unable to say definitely when the night of war turns into the day of peace. In which case what becomes of our starting-point?

Or if I may use another illustration and compare the desolation passing over the earth to the flood that overwhelmed it in the days of Noah, I may remind you that when at last the waters abated and the dry land began to appear it was 'the tops of the mountains' that were first seen. One cannot build much on the tops of mountains! Very rough huts may have to serve us as temporary quarters for the somewhat ill-assorted people that may emerge from the ark.

It would be well to allow a little more fully, than is often done, for the interim period—the twilight of returning day or the drying up of an earth soaked with blood—call it what you will, which must elapse before we get down to large constructive work. Salvage work of the most perilous kind, and of the highest order of quality, must precede the laying of the foundations of the New Order which we plan. We shall need emergency plans, alternative plans, and all the gifts of improvisation for many days—and years to come.

In the second place the question arises: Who will co-operate in the New Order? At the present time we think of the world as divided into two camps—Hitler's new order with its dominant Reich surrounded by servile States and, on the other, a confederation of States roughly basing their economic and political life on the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The former is clear—and repulsive. The latter is attractive and vague. The former, relying on brute force, is horribly practicable. The latter, relying on wisdom, reasonableness, and goodwill is difficult. It is exposed to the risk of failure through jealousies, grudges, and general differences of temperament. Above all, it will have to reckon with the revival of neutrality. At the moment we are all Yes men or No men (the wisest of us know how to be both) but it may be a temptation when the time comes to contract out. No one knows how far President Roosevelt will be able to take the American people who failed President Wilson at the moment of crisis, nor does any one know whether Scandinavia

has even yet learnt through all its sufferings to forswear its traditional policy of neutrality.

Probably no greater service could be rendered to the coming of a New Order, based upon honest all-in co-operation, than to attack with all the powers at our command the doctrine of neutrality with its implications, religious, social, or international. We have so recently escaped ourselves from this particular lie in the soul, as regards our foreign policy, that we forget how insidious and far-reaching is its influence. We know that it took the form of non-intervention on this side of the Atlantic and isolationism on the other with the most destructive consequences. We know that like a canker it ate out the heart of the League of Nations, leaving it to rot and die. But do we realize that it is our own inner attitude of neutrality which disables us for any service of a righteous God? The disease goes very deep and, unless we are healed of it, we shall never be able to play an effective part in the creation of a New Order wherein good shall triumph over evil. It is a hard lesson to learn, even though the laws of the universe reject neutrality and history records its tragic failures. Again and again the individual or the nation makes the great refusal. We are all apt to close our eyes to the heavenly visions and 'contract out of the divine adventure.'

For this reason we must put the moral education of our own people and our Allies in the forefront of our present programme. It is not enough simply to stir up trouble in the oppressed countries, to encourage sabotage and keep alive the spirit of revolt. The unalterable distinction between good and evil; the responsibility of man for building his world on moral foundations; the inevitability of choice and decision—these are the lessons we must all learn if ever we are to be the sound architects of the future when this tyranny is overpast. If we were to emerge from this war having victoriously said 'No' to Hitler but never having learnt humbly to say 'Yes' to God, we should be ill-prepared for our future tasks. We should soon founder on the rocks of self-interest. The escape from neutrality which has begun must be perfected in the moral sphere; there will then be no selfish withdrawal in the hour of our peace-making. We shall not suddenly hear from some unexpected quarter the old cry: 'To your tents, O Israel! Now see to thine own house, David!'

In the third place, it has to be remembered that the political organizations of the world can never be all of one piece. There will always be a distinction between the mature and the immature peoples, and provision must be made for the gradual transition of protected to autonomous political life. The severest criticism of the German new order lies in the fact that, though it provides amply for the ambitions as well as the needs of one dominant *Herrenvolk*, it condemns the rest of the world to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. With unlimited force at its disposal, it would be no difficult matter for the German Reich to maintain its new order at least for a generation, but it requires unlimited statesmanship and Christianity to make a success of the complicated relations of States in different stages of development, seeking to establish a new life on the basis of justice and freedom.

How is Abyssinia at one end of the scale to be helped to abolish slavery and work out good relations between feudal Amharas and semi-barbarous Dinkas? How is India at the other end of the scale to reconcile its conflict of religions and achieve both unity and independence? What system can be devised by which Crown colonies will gradually become constitutional protectorates and finally self-governing communities? Can we say that the democratic institutions of the west are of universal application all the world over? If so, by what methods and along what route shall we reach the goal?

While we proceed with courage in the re-ordering of the world, we must beware of seeking immediate Utopias. No doubt some form of Utopia, whether in the realm of history or in the eternal order, must always be in the mind of the Christian. Even Professor Carr, who has exposed the dangers of Utopianism in his brilliant work, *Twenty Years' Crisis*, would admit as much. But we forget at our peril the finite limitations of man's possible achievements over against the infinite character of the aspirations which haunt him and the ends which he is bound to pursue. There is a dualism in practical life which cannot easily be resolved. Power and morality remain uneasy partners in controlling the social relations of mankind. It is through the constant tension between them that man's history as a political animal is developed. Professor Carr's carefully balanced statement is worth bearing in mind by all who long for the substitution of morality for power, and especially by the Church which has so often mistaken the limits of moral suasion.

'The fatal dualism of politics will always keep considerations of morality entangled with considerations of power. We shall never arrive at a political order in which the grievance of the weak and the few receives the same prompt attention as the grievance of the strong and the many. Power goes far to create the morality convenient to itself and coercion is a fruitful source of content. But, when all these reserves have been made, it remains true that a new international order and a new international harmony can be built up only on the basis of an ascendancy

which is generally accepted as tolerant and unoppressive, or, at any rate, as preferable to any practical alternative. To create these conditions is the moral task of the ascendant Power or Powers.'

The last sentence is particularly significant in relation to the situation which will probably confront us at the end of the war when small and exhausted nations will need protection, when others will be clamouring for immediate self-government or independence, and when the regrouping of economic interests in relation to a larger whole must be undertaken. There must be 'ascendant Powers' to preside over the resettlement, and at present it would seem as if the choice lay between the Axis powers on the one hand and America, Britain, China, and Russia on the other. The dangers of an 'ascendancy' are obvious, but they cannot be avoided, and it is our contention that they are infinitely less if the 'ascendancy' is in the hands of one group. With all its defects Anglo-Saxon morality has its roots in justice and freedom, and the Union of the Soviet Republic points the way not only to the inclusion of diverse peoples in a system generously conceived, but also preserves the essential emphasis on 'proletariat rights' within the internal economy. Under such an ascendancy it is not impossible to believe that claims so various as Indian independence, Colonial self-government, Abyssinian cultural and economic development may be satisfactorily and fairly met.

In the fourth place, there is the question of how war mentality is to be changed to a constructive peace mentality where leaders and peoples are concerned. George Washington was no competent organizer of the New Order in America when the war of liberation was ended. It would not be amiss for those who may have the shaping of a New Order in Europe to familiarize themselves again with the disillusionments, the disappointments, and the clash of personalities which attended the rise of the great Republic overseas. The beautiful New Order was soon the battleground between farmer and town-dweller, between the interests of capital and the interests of the small man. Later, its admirably balanced constitution became largely inoperative through the mercenary corruption of its civic life, and the noble dream of Thomas Jefferson resolved itself into an oppressive plutocracy from which it has taken the defiant protest of Theodore Roosevelt, followed by the constructive efforts of his still greater namesake, Franklin Roosevelt, to deliver it. The New Order in America is only beginning to emerge a hundred and fifty years after the opportunity came to start it. War is ill preparation for peace, and the switch over from destruction to construction difficult to achieve. National unity accepted under pressure during war time, unless riveted during that period by moral and spiritual consent, tends to disintegrate when the pressure is removed, and the work of reconstruction tends to be indefinitely postponed through factional strife. The word 'factional' perhaps needs to be emphasized, as there is and always must be some tension in the progressive development of human affairs.

But not to stray too far from the point at the moment, the question of peace leadership as distinct from war leadership is a serious question. We have had in our own recent history the great dynamic leadership of Mr. Lloyd George in war time succeeded by a period of disappointment and frustration under the same leadership. It is probable that the blame, lightly attached to the individual, rests rather on the war-weary nation he was expected to lead. However that may be it remains that the man, who can unify and inspire the nation in time of war and who can collect round him suitable men to help him in winning the war, may be incapable, either by temperament or character or previous entanglements, from leading his own and other nations into a new economic and social order. The nation must preserve an open and intelligent mind on that question. In rewarding its saviour, as it ought to do, it must not mortgage its own future. It must choose him or any other who is best fitted for the forward march.

Here again it would seem as if the best service the Church could render the nation is to join with people of goodwill and forethought, who are seeking to create an inner core of intelligent and dynamic opinion which will be able to resist the physical weariness and moral inertia which may succeed the war. In other words, the effort must be made to create and sustain, not a sentimental but a practical peace mentality in war time, one which accepts the present necessity of war with a sober realism, but has begun to live spiritually in the opportunity which will come later. The switch-over which is so essential, when the time comes, must begin now in the minds of the leaders of all parties, whether they are to be found in the universities or in the factories or amongst the men and women who hope to be demobilized later. We need not be in any way less useful citizens or soldiers because of this switch-over. We shall certainly be better Christians.

Lastly, and as a development of this theme of a new mentality, let it be remembered that every planned society depends upon the character and competence of its administrators and officials. And here we touch upon the problem of bureaucracy and the need of a Civil Service possessing the mentality to work a New Order. Bureaucracy can be a formidable obstacle to new adventures and

new technique. Considering its general record it is discouraging to think of the process being developed on an ever-widening scale. It is positively depressing if the definition of bureaucracy, as given in the Encyclopaedia of Social Services, may be taken as broadly true. 'Bureaucracy is the term usually applied to a system of government the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials that their power jeopardizes the liberties of ordinary citizens. The characteristics of such a regime are a passion for routine in administration, the sacrifice of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decisions, and a refusal to embark upon experiments. In extreme cases the members of a bureaucracy may become a hereditary caste manipulating government to their own advantage.'

It would be a great disaster if we were compelled to pour the new wine of the new order into old bottles of this description (though we do not feel our home-grown bureaucracy in England is quite so dangerous as the genuine article would seem to imply). Yet how singularly little attention is given to this particular problem by the architects of the New Order itself. It is evident that all the dangers implicit in State Socialism must be present to a far larger degree in the plans which they have in mind and must be guarded against or at least lessened as far as possible by the utmost forethought. Perhaps the most crucial question that can be asked in any discussion on a new order is the very simple one: Who are the people who are to work it and what are they like?

Not long ago in an article on 'Industry after the War' the special correspondent of *The Times* remarked that the socialistic alternative to *laissez faire* was killed in this country by two things: (1) 'the ideological aversion to the electorate'; (2) the Civil Servant's conviction that he was neither competent nor willing to run industry. When this war is over there will no longer be an ideological aversion to Socialism. The die is cast with regard to the general tendency of our political development, though it will probably take a more flexible and more varied form than the State Socialism of the text-books. The way will be open for far-reaching changes which must involve, however much we seek to guard private initiative, a vast amount of public guidance, direction, and control. The State will require a vast number of people whose business it will be to keep the machinery of our communal life running smoothly, and who will direct its production of goods and their distribution. It cannot be otherwise. The bigger the plan—the bigger the personnel involved.

It will create a serious situation, therefore, if the country having turned its face towards some new form of a socialist State, having in fact overcome its 'ideological aversion,' should find itself hampered and frustrated at every turn by the inability or unwillingness of its Civil Service and Municipal employees to co-operate with sympathy and intelligence. Yet apart from the teaching profession which has for long had liberal and democratic tendencies, the country cannot count upon an adequate supply, from its own servants, of men and women who will heartily co-operate with the new adventure. Great as are the benefits in normal times of an irremovable Civil Service, in revolutionary times we can see the other side. There is not much to be said for 'the spoils of office' system as practised in America. It was a decisive down-grade step when President Jackson introduced it as part of the electoral system. But once in a way, when 'once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,' there is a natural longing to be able to get rid of 'the old gang' steeped in the ways and customs of the old order and begin with people who really believe in the New Order and mean to work it for all it is worth.

We cannot be too sure that such a general clearing out will not take place. The country has had more than one political revolution. It might, with all its innate conservatism, decide angrily that it would have an economic and bureaucratic one. It will depend on how wisely the 'governing classes' adapt themselves to the new situation and the new rôle they will be expected to play. But if that is not to happen, if we are not to use all our efforts to make it happen, it is evident that the mentality of our bureaucracy must be radically changed. Just as our foreign relations have suffered from the Foreign Office traditions which belong to an oligarchic and aristocratic age, so our social relations have suffered from traditions which belong to the Poor Law. Even the best of our administrative staff (and how excellent are the best) find themselves hampered by the policy which rules at the top and the inertia which prevails at the bottom of their particular departments.

Here, again, is a task which vitally concerns the New Order, the humanizing and democratizing of the official element in the nation. It is the only rational policy to pursue, for we cannot be governed without ministries—and ministries with all their bureaucratic accompaniment. We may laugh with Charles Dickens in his description of the 'Circumlocution Office,' or with Edward Shanks in his romance of Whitehall entitled *Old Indispensables*, but governed we must be in any order new or old, and bureaucrats we must have of one kind or another.

Bertrand Russell's protest may stand as a warning about the dangers inseparable to all government, but the risks are inevitable. In *Roads to*

Freedom, writing of the economic power of the State and the influence it can assert through its bureaucracy, he expressed himself with some violence, 'Given an official caste, however selected, there are bound to be a set of men whose whole instincts will drive them towards tyranny. Together with the natural love of power they will have a rooted conviction (visible now in the higher ranks of the Civil Service) that they alone know enough to be able to judge what is for the good of the community. Like all men who administer a system they will come to feel the system itself sacrosanct.'

But Bertrand Russell had no faith in a Christian gospel or in the spiritual impulses which flow from the change of heart or change of mind which it can achieve. Part of our business is to change the mentality of the nation and specially of its leaders and administrators. No official caste need be regarded as impervious to the cleansing and liberating influence of the gospel—certainly not until far more intelligent and sustained efforts have been made to regenerate it. It is possible that a great deal may be done by new methods of recruiting and training and the introduction of new standards of efficiency, but there is also a great contribution to be made along such spiritual lines as the Church can provide.

It would be a mistake to abandon our faith in the possibility of 'changing' human nature at the very moment of entering upon a New Order. Our faith in democracy only survives because we believe it is capable of radical transformation to meet the demands of the new age. But for all that we do believe in democracy. It is much less difficult to believe in bureaucracy as a possible instrument of use to the New Order. Like democracy itself it can be revitalized and made subservient to a new outlook on human affairs. At any rate the experiment is worth trying.

Here are these footnotes to the study of a great subject. They are all more or less connected with the human factor in the situation. They deserve to be taken into account. Perhaps they are more than footnotes and deserve to be taken into the text. The reader must decide.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Black-out.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.D.,
Flemington, Victoria, Australia.

'There was a darkness over all the earth.'—Lk 23^{44}.

Melbourne had her first 'black-out' a short time ago. I wonder how many of us saw it. A minister in England whose books I read has told us that a man recently said to him, 'I used to study the stars when I was a boy and lived in the country. The glare of the city lights hides them. I don't think I have seen the stars for twenty-five years. The black-out has given us back the stars.' Now, you can easily see how that is. Our great electric lights have dimmed them. The dancing Neon signs have dazzled our sight. But in the black-out we are able to see them clearly. The black-out has given them back to us.

In the New Testament we read the story of a great black-out. The Gospels tell us of two men who saw something they had not seen before. One was a Jew and the other a heathen. The Jew had lived a bad life, but we have nothing to show that the heathen had lived a bad life. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that he lived a good life, the best life he knew in the light of the knowledge of right and wrong that he had.

Well, this black-out took place when our Lord was hanging on the Cross. Beside Him, you remember, there was hanging on another cross a Jew who had been a robber. He had joined with the other thief—for, you remember, there were two thieves crucified with our Lord—in flinging insults at Jesus. But after a time he became ashamed, for Jesus made no reply to his jeers. He bore them with patience and kindness, for He knew what the poor fellow was feeling—pain, and loneliness, and fear, and anger against those who put him there. And then to make matters worse a great darkness came down over the earth. And through it all Jesus uttered not one word of blame on any one. When the poor wretched man saw that, he knew that his Companion on the next cross was no ordinary man, and, longing for better things in the next life, he said, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' And Jesus promised he would be with Him in heaven that day. In the black-out of the sky and the black-out of wrongdoing a bad man saw the love of God in Christ and found peace.

The other man who saw something for the first time that day was the Roman N.C.O. in charge of the soldiers that put Jesus to death. As he stood there by the Cross doing his duty he heard the taunts of the thieves and of the enemies of our Lord. But from Jesus he heard not one word of blame or hate. No, what he heard was a prayer

to God asking forgiveness for those who did this cruel thing. He heard Jesus speak to His mother and to St. John, making arrangements even in all His agony that His mother might be cared for by some one He knew and loved. He saw Him die in the black-out of men's hate and cruelty, still loving them and trusting in God. And though this honest, heathen soldier knew nothing of the Father whom Jesus showed to men, he knew how to admire courage in pain, and care for others. That black-out, which lasted three hours, showed him something he had never seen —the love and the forgiveness of God. And you don't wonder—do you ?—that, when he saw it, he said, 'Truly this man was the Son of God.'

And so, you see, the Cross of Christ shines through the darkness of wilful wrongdoing and of heathen ignorance, showing the love and the mercy of God. You remember what the Psalmist said ? 'When I look up into the heavens and see the stars, I think of how small a thing man is, and yet Thou lovest him and comest to dwell with Him !

Work.

By the Reverend J. W. Bowden, Handsworth, Birmingham.

'My Father worketh, and I work.'—Jn 5^{17}.

There is a little prayer which I suppose we have all heard and probably used, and it has been put into a verse.

Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray Thee, Lord, my soul to keep
If I should die before I wake,
I pray Thee, Lord, my soul to take.

That is very good. But have you ever heard the prayer that Jack London wrote ? Let me say, first of all, that Jack London was a writer of most interesting stories. I doubt if you will ever forget *White Fang* or *The Call of the Wild* once you have read them. They are both lovely stories about dogs. They both show how love and kindness can win, even animals, when force and cruelty fail.

Well, here is the prayer that Jack London wrote.

Now I get up to do my work
I pray Thee, Lord, I may not shirk
If I should die before the night
I pray the Lord my work's all right.

Don't you think that is fine ? I do. Jack London must have worked very hard. His biographer tells us that he had little or no education when he was a boy. He did not begin to write until he was a man, but he worked eighteen hours a day when he was writing a book. He died when he was about forty and had written more than fifty books which made him famous all over the world. He was a lovable and happy man, and I am quite sure that it was because he enjoyed doing his work.

You cannot read the New Testament without seeing that it was just the same with Jesus. When He was twelve years old He said to His mother, 'Know ye not that I must be about my Father's work ?' Later He said, 'My Father worketh and I work,' and 'I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day: for the night cometh when no man can work.' Just before He died He said, 'I have finished the work thou gavest me to do.' Great men have told us and, indeed, we all know that hard work always brings happiness.

Hard work is not easy. How can it be ? But somehow it brings real joy with it. Of course, we do not all have the work we would most like to do, but it is surprising how interesting most of it becomes when we give our mind to it and put our heart into it.

One lovely summer morning Pleasure set out from his home determined to have a good time. Through the fields and woods he went and everything seemed to promise a glorious day. A little while later Duty left his home and set out to do his work. He was not feeling very happy about it because there were other things he wanted to do. He took the same way that Pleasure had gone before him. He had not gone very far before he found Pleasure fast asleep under a tree. Duty woke Pleasure from his sleep. Pleasure was feeling rather miserable, and Duty was none too happy until they both walked arm in arm and found themselves talking of the wonderful and beautiful world all around them and of the great opportunities that lay before them.

Our prayer is work and our work is prayer.

Duty and Pleasure must go arm in arm if they want to find joy.

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

Extol His Unlikeness !

By the Reverend John L. Kent, M.A., Cathcart, Glasgow.

'In all points . . . like . . . yet.'—He 4^{15}.

To the reverent reader two things are clear about Jesus. He was very like us and at the same time very different. In every respect He was just the same as we are, yet in every respect He was very unlike us. His likeness and His unlikeness are the most arresting features of His life.

He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, ate the same food, wore the same clothes, did the same work, spoke the same language, lived the same life, and died the same death as His fellowmen. 'In all points like, yet——' While His sandalled feet trod the same hard-beaten road as His brethren, His soul was like a star and dwelt apart. He had food to eat that men knew not of, His work had an origin and purpose that mystified men, His language had a significance their minds could not comprehend, His life had a depth they could not fathom, His death had a glory that dazzled them. 'In all points like, yet——'

The likeness and unlikeness of Jesus represent the greatness of this figure whose shadow lies athwart human history, the secret of the spell He

has cast over the human heart. Jesus is not one, He is two—a personality we can understand, who comes close to us all and lies into all the dimples and folds of our human nature; and a personality who mystifies us, reaching beyond the scope of our common life, losing contact with earth and time, and carrying us far beyond the borders of another world. We cannot know Jesus, cannot apprehend anything of what He means, unless we keep these two—two who are yet one—always in our minds. 'In all points like, yet——'

For a generation, however, we have been emphasizing His likeness to the exclusion of His unlikeness. It has been good to see how much He resembles us. It has been a privilege to company with this man who has so much in common with us. But we have overdone it. For years now in our biographies of Him, in our commentaries on His life, in our sermons on His faith we have been so concentrating men's attention on the points in which He is like us that the other Christ, the Christ who is so unlike us, has been passing beyond our calculation and vision. A young man once wrote the life of Joan of Arc, leaving out the visions and voices of the saints. It was an interesting story, but it was not the story of Joan of Arc. No more is the Christ in whom many of our fellowmen have come to believe. Leave out the points in which He differs from us—the incalculable, the mysterious, the supernatural—and you may have a Christ, but He is not the Christ of the New Testament and of Christian experience. The Christ who has effected His triumphant march across the earth these two thousand years has not lit His road by the cold gleam of rationalistic daylight but by the light that never was on sea or land. 'In all points like, yet——'

This likeness and unlikeness appear throughout the whole earthly career of our Lord. There is hardly a saying of His or an incident in which He touches others' lives that does not bring to us that in which He is like us and that in which He is different.

Look at the experience to which our text immediately refers. He was like us in His temptations. We are all tempted. So was Jesus. But see Him in His temptations! One of His struggles concerned a very common experience—hunger. He had eaten nothing for forty days. He had been so concerned with His soul that He had starved His body. At the end of forty days He was gripped by the agony of hunger. His flesh was crying out for food. And He was tempted—tempted to turn a stone into bread and satisfy Himself. Jesus was like men. He had to grapple with the raging fiend of hunger and felt the sharp pain of all its temptations. Yet Jesus was unlike men. Hunger could not break down His overmastering resistance. With calm deliberation and majestic strength He hurled it from Him. Its temptations were powerless before His impregnable defences. His strength was unimpaired, His integrity intact, His fellowship with God unbroken, His soul inviolate. Before this and every other temptation that laid siege to His soul He stood invincible. In this He was like no other man. He was tempted in all points like as we are yet without sin. In virtue of His unlikeness He is able to succour them who are tempted. Not because He was like us and felt the thrust and stab of temptation but because, unlike us, He could defeat its every strategy He is our defence. Emphasize what is common between Him and us and we may receive consolation, but no hope. Say in every hour of the soul's trial, 'Jesus knows our every weakness,' and we may derive a measure of comfort, but no strong reinforcement of moral energy. The hope of the soul's conquest is in this, that though He too was tempted He knew no sin and therefore is able to give us the victory. Exalt His unlikeness!

This principle, however, we have said, extends beyond the temptations of Jesus. It runs through His whole life. It is the thread on which every word and deed is strung. Look at His teaching. How human it is! Never was such profound doctrine framed in such simple language. Not a concept or phrase lies beyond the experience of the common man. A parent's troubles with his sons, Jesus knew them and employed them as the medium of His truth. A farmer's perplexities with seed, soil, and servants, He understood them and made them the vehicle of His message. Shepherds and soldiers, housewives and merchants, legislators and slaves—all types and interests of humanity were called with expert insight into the service of His teaching. Not a man, of whatever rank, but feels that Jesus knows him. He answers his questions. He solves his riddles. He satisfies his needs. So like man was Jesus. Let any one stand up and say: 'The curing of the world's woes waits for the application of the teaching of Jesus,' and the world will echo with applause. But little more than acclamation will result. Men will say, 'Yes, that's true, we must do something about it,' and then subside into forgetfulness and neglect. His teaching gains their approval but does not command their obedience. It exercises little purchase over their wills. And why, why when it has won their assent has it no force in their affairs? One reason is this. Men have forgotten that Jesus is not only like us, He is unlike us. 'Never man spake like this man.' 'He speaks with authority and not as the scribes.' We have not emphasized that the human teaching was uttered with the Divine voice. It is not a man like us who speaks straight to our heart and conscience, but God. Because He knows us with such unerring discernment and touches us always on the quick, His judgments cannot be accepted or rejected according to our mood or circumstance, for, unlike any other man's, they are the judgments of God.' He speaks imperiously because He speaks from the throne of the world. His words demand not discussion but acceptance and committal. Say, 'This is none other than the Son of God' and His teaching will shape your destiny. Proclaim His unlikeness!

Or look at Christ's Cross. We have revolted against the old mechanical theories in which the death of Jesus was interpreted. They hid the human Jesus from our eyes and made Him remote

and unintelligible. Now we understand the Cross, for we see it in the light of experiences with which we are familiar. Who put Him to death? Not a strange, exacting God, but men. Men and circumstances conspired against Him, as they might against us, and put Him to death. Why did He die? Not to satisfy a blind, inhuman principle, but to keep His conscience clean and maintain His integrity to the end. We see forces, represented by people we know, crowding upon Him and leading Him to Calvary. Treacherous Judas, frightened disciples, prejudiced ecclesiastics, fickle and ungrateful common people, nervous imperial officials are among the multitude responsible for His crucifixion. Jesus died as any rebel against the accepted or ruling authority to-day might die. Even in His death He was like us. But He was also unlike us. He did not merely die as any hero among us might, leading a cause with unyielding will and unswerving devotion. In His death He was accomplishing something that man could and can never do. He was revealing a love that man, without Jesus, can never discover. He was communicating a power that man, without Jesus, can never possess. He was vouchsafing a forgiveness of which man, without Jesus, can never be sure. He was offering an Eternal life which man, without Jesus, can never win or deserve. Extol His unlikeness!

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Christian Certainties.

'And there was much murmuring among the people concerning him: for some said, He is a good man: others said, Nay; but he deceiveth the people.'—Jn 7^{12}.

Had they lived to-day they might have added that Jesus was self-deluded. Such, at any rate, was the opinion of one eminent literary critic who has since found deeper things. His conclusion was that Jesus, splendid teacher though He was, suffered from 'the delusion of God.' As it is, the text paints a picture of bewilderment and uncertainty. They couldn't make up their minds about Him. The ringing note of authority in His voice was unmistakable. They felt that. The Roman soldiers who were sent to arrest Him returned empty-handed, and saying in extenuation of their failure, 'Never man spake like this man.' He made staggering claims for Himself. He forgave sins, and in so doing exercised the prerogatives of God. He achieved wonderful deeds of healing. These marvellous sayings and deeds amazed them. Some were almost persuaded to accept His message. 'When Christ cometh will He do more than this man hath done?' Others were definitely against Him, His own brethren were ranked among them, and, moreover, the official custodians of the national religion had not yet declared themselves, but were known to be suspicious and resentful. Here we have a picture of uncertainty and bewilderment and doubt. In Jn 10^{24} we read, 'How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.'

It is a mood that we can understand. Most of us have suffered from it. To-day it is widely prevalent. The times are serious and dangerous. The firm regulative beliefs of other days have been gravely shaken. Yet many people wish they could have some sure word concerning God. It is no longer true to say that 'men are looking for a religion shorn of dogma.' No preaching of religion is likely to be of lasting value unless there is a streak of uncompromising dogma in it. The cry *to-day* is. 'How long dost thou make us to doubt? Tell us plainly.' People are tired of inconclusiveness and argument. They are saying, 'Tell us what you know, and tell us plainly. Say it with authority, the authority born of personal experience. We can be trusted to recognize a great truth when we hear it, especially if there is the authentic beat of personal experience in it.'

Earth is incomplete without the sky; man's spirit is incomplete and unfulfilled without faith in God. Now, there are three or four convictions that are reasonable and helpful. We want to underline these and in doing so attempt to help to nurture the faith that underlies physical, mental, and spiritual health.

Our first conviction is *that God speaks to us through the Universe.* In an ecstatic moment Margaret Fuller said, 'I accept the Universe,' to which blunt Thomas Carlyle said, 'God, she'd better.' We, too, might begin there. When we do accept the Universe, what does it say to us? There are more difficulties than illumination in regarding it. One eminent scientist regards it as 'a chapter of lucky accidents.' The chapter is too long and the luck too continuous for that view to be convincing. The difficulties of *unbelief* are very impressive. To be sure, the Universe is of amazing extent. Astronomical data paralyse the imagination. It is complex and mysterious, and yet it manifests the marks of order, of unity, of law. It is understandable, and that simple yet profound fact makes science possible. When we reckon in *all* the facts, including the facts of human nature, it bears all the marks and evidence of creative mind. In science and philosophy the creative hypothesis now holds the field. Sir Arthur Eddington has said, cautiously, 'Science does not indicate whether the world-spirit is good or evil, but it does perhaps justify us in applying the adjective creative.' It is part of our Christian faith that God speaks to us, reveals Himself, through the unity, order, variety, mystery, and beauty of the Universe.

God speaks to us through conscience! That is our second conviction! Conscience, in some ways, is the highest gift we possess. It is a significant and wonderful thing that we know the difference between right and wrong. To be sure, these often shade into one another, and it is sometimes difficult to tell where one ends and the other begins. But that is not the important point. When the difference *is* plain we *do* know that there is a great gulf fixed between them and that they carry in their implications the issues of spiritual life and death. When conscience speaks with no uncertain voice we are face to face with God. We are taught that

heredity and environment have played a part in the fashioning of conscience. We won't deny that. We are told that conscience is 'the voice of society heavily disguised.' There is an element of truth in that too. But there is a greater truth than these. A thing *is* what it has the capacity to become. Conscience has the capacity to become the voice of God to us. Let us hold to that.

God speaks to us through Scripture. The Old Testament is full of God. One modern novelist has expressed the view that the English Bible has exercised an inhibiting influence on the development of English literature. His must be a solitary voice. His dictum is not a reflection on the Bible: it is a reflection on himself. Take the influence of the Bible out of English literature and a large part of its richest content will have gone. But the Bible does more. It brings us face to face with God. We won't quarrel with those whose view of the Bible is different from ours. We find it possible to accept many of the results of modern scholarship, and it leaves the foundation of our faith unshaken and strengthened. But for all who read it understandingly, whatever their view, it throbs with the voice of God.

In the New Testament His voice becomes even clearer. Do we read it? It was written by men whose experiences differed entirely. They developed their own peculiar angle of vision. Yet through all their writings there shines one great certainty. God is real! He is near! He cares for us! His name is love! This unanimity is impressive and moving. The great modern cry is 'on with the evolution of the super-man.' How tired one gets of this cult of strength and mere cleverness. What a mess the 'super-men' are making of the world! There is a higher and finer and more thoroughgoing education available for us all. We will find it in the New Testament, which speaks of God whose Son was the greatest of all teachers.

God speaks to us through Christ. That is our final conviction. When we are making up our minds about this world and the meaning of life and all its varied circumstances, let us be sure that we are taking into account all the facts. We have to take into account the fact of Christ. How can we account for Him save in terms of God? As one outstanding modern philosopher has put it, God has entered so intimately into the human situation that *one* human life has become the perfect vehicle of His Nature and Purpose. In Jesus Christ He has drawn near and speaks to us in a language that all men can understand. He does not overwhelm us with His majesty and mystery. There is no pomp, no splendour, nothing to shatter us. There is the strong, tender pleading of a Great Teacher, the healing of His touch, the persuasiveness of His love, the moving, heart-breaking, uncondemning pathos and splendour of His death and resurrection, the crowning blessedness of His eternal companionship. How can we truly consider Jesus, and miss the authentic impact of Almighty God! [1]

[1] J. Short, *All Things are Yours*, 190.

PALM SUNDAY.

The Father's Gift.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. F. HUXTABLE, M.A., NEWTON ABBOT.

'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?'—Jn 18^{11}.

Jesus is facing His last and fiercest strife. The Cross is inescapable. He must go to the agony of that shameful death 'for us men and for our salvation.' Judas brings a band with swords and staves to take away Him whom he shall kiss. The craft of the priests, the determination of the Pharisees, the hand-washing irresponsibility of Pilate, the fickle mood of the multitude—all these conspire to bring Jesus to a felon's death. He is, indeed, the victim of man's sin.

At last Peter sees it clearly. This is what Jesus had said would come. But how could it be true? The utter wrongness of Christ's treatment at the hands of men fills Peter's mind, and he makes one desperate effort to pit his frail strength against the sinful intentions of man and the holy purpose of God. 'Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his ear.' It could never be said that no one had lifted a hand to defend Jesus.

But, just as Jesus had rebuked Peter when he had told Him that such a death should be far from Him, so He rebukes Peter now. 'Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' 'The cup'—we all know what that means: God's will for Him. 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink?' That is what He asked James and John when they came with their monstrous request that they should sit on either side of their Master in His glory. Are you able to share My destiny, God's purpose for me? 'The cup.' Jesus had no illusions about its contents. He knew that the Father's will demanded all that even the only-begotten of the Father could give. Not for nothing did the Lord and Master of us all sweat great drops of blood as He prayed, 'O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt, be done.' 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' In the volume of the book it was written of Him, 'Lo! I come to do thy will, O my God.' 'He became obedient unto death.'

Let us look into these words: they are written for our learning.

I.

'My Father.' Did words ever occur in such an amazing context? Perfect obedience has brought Him to shameful, torturing death: yet He says, 'My Father.'

In similar circumstances men speak differently. Apparent calamity does not often inspire the language of devotion. When we set our hands to noble tasks and success does not crown our efforts we say that fate is against us, and, in

despair, we give up the task. We blame fate. Man does not often speak of God when he is in adversity, save to upbraid Him, or deny Him. Why does God allow it? If God were all-loving and almighty, would He permit such things to be? So men speak. So we speak. Sometimes we tell ourselves grim fairy stories of a world in which there is no God but only a spiteful fate, to whom we are as flies to wanton boys: or else we take unnatural pleasure in thinking that we are but a puppet-show to amuse the President of the Immortals. Not so Jesus: He says, 'My Father.'

What an arresting fact of our Lord's earthly life it is that He always called God 'My Father.' He who knew a communion with God that we shall never know until we see God face to face, and also knew what it was to be desolate and forsaken had but one name for God: 'My Father.'

I do not presume to exhort you to strive for that faith. Faith, though it requires resolution, is supremely the gift of God. You cannot achieve it. God must give it. But I do exhort you to pray that God will give you that gift. Ask that you may always be able to say 'My Father': not only when life goes well with you, but also when your hopes are dashed to the ground, when your children disappoint you, when your friends fail you and misunderstand you, when your loved ones are taken from you, when the world seems utterly dark, when your sight of God grows dim, when temptations set upon you with hellish fury and cunning charm, when you have fallen into sin, when you come to the last dark hour—pray that in all life's vicissitudes you may say 'My Father.'

Never shall I forget a friend of mine who lost his sight. He had never seen well, and from an early age he had been obliged to use Braille. When he had reached young manhood, a surgeon thought that there might be some chance of restoring sight to those eager eyes. An operation was performed. Then came a period of waiting. Would the operation be successful? What excitement, what rapture shone on his face one afternoon as he and I were walking on the banks of the Isis near Oxford. He clutched my arm and exclaimed, 'That's the leaf of a tree!' For the first time in nearly twenty years he had seen something that God had made. But the restoration of his sight lasted only a few days; and within a few weeks the specialists came to the reluctant conclusion that nothing more could be done. On the morning on which the news came, he sat beside me at prayers in College Chapel. We sang 'How firm a foundation'; and his voice was firmer than mine. Later we said the Lord's prayer. He said it with us: 'Our Father . . . Thy will be done. . . . Give us this day our daily bread. . . . Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. . . .' Ever since that day I have prayed that God would give me a faith like that.

II.

'The cup which my Father giveth me.' There are occasions when we are given presents. At Christmas or on birthdays our loved ones show their love and goodwill for us by making gifts; and we accept them, not only because they are themselves worth having, but even more because of the love which prompted the giving. Jesus, so the text tells us, saw the cup which He had to drink as a gift from His Father: 'which my Father giveth me.' The cup was bitter. It was full of woe. It contained the wine of God's wrath against all unrighteousness and sin. This was a cup of bitterness and gall which must, at all costs, be drunk to the dregs. But the hands which lifted that cup to His lips were not strange, unknown hands: they were His Father's. 'Shall I not drink it?'

That is how God deals with us all. There is a cup which the Father is offering you to drink. He has some purpose for you. Maybe He will call you to some path of service overseas which will involve more sacrifice than a man will make lightly—all real service is costly. It may be that there is some suffering through which you are to pass, or He may will that you should pass through some experience whereby He may strengthen your faith, and draw you nearer to Himself. I do not know what it is for you. I am only beginning to learn what it is for myself. But whoever you may be, and whatever cup is being held to your lips, it is the Lord who holds the cup. Like Job of old, you may never understand what good has been accomplished by your drinking of the cup. You may never be permitted to see how your obedience furthers the purpose of God. You may never know how your suffering has been part of the travail which makes His kingdom come. But in the end you will learn that no blessedness in life is equal to that of drinking this cup. It is the only way, because the Father commands what will bring blessedness and appoints what will give everlasting joy. His statutes are set to music. Are they not the marching songs of His pilgrim people?

> But if Himself He come to thee, and stand
> Beside thee, gazing down on thee with eyes
> That smile, and suffer; that will pierce thine heart,
> With their own pity, to a passionate peace;
> And reach to thee Himself the Holy Cup
> (With all its wreathen stems of passion-flowers
> And quivering sparkles of the ruby stars),
> Pallid and royal, saying, 'Drink with Me';
> Wilt thou refuse? Nay, not for Paradise!
> The pale brow will compel thee, the pure hands
> Will minister unto thee; thou shalt take
> Of that communion through the solemn depths
> Of the dark waters of thine agony,
> With heart that praises Him, that yearns to Him
> The closer through that hour.

'Wilt thou refuse? Nay, not for Paradise!' 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' 'Lo! I come to do thy will, O my God.' Make that your prayer, your vow, day by day. Make it your daily consecration to say that you will drink the cup which your Father gives.

You do say, I hope, every day, 'Thy will be done.' This consecration is part of what you ought to mean every time you say that petition of the Lord's Prayer. I know that 'Thy will be done' has many meanings. When we say it, we ought to be praying that God's will may be done throughout the world, in our own nation, in our own town, in our own Church, in our own homes. But what right have we to pray that these things may come to pass, unless and until we have prayed, 'Thy will be done in me'?

Easter Day.

The Relevance of the Resurrection.

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D.,
Chaplain, Royal Navy.

'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

'Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.'—1 Co $15^{57, 58}$.

A generation ago men were asking, 'Is the Easter story really true?' To-day they are more inclined to ask, 'Is the Easter story relevant?' The scepticism, which was based on a slavish devotion to the methods of physical science, has given way to a scepticism as to whether anything can save the world from the descent into the pit. The world's travail has become so huge, and dark, and overwhelming, that the outcome to many seems remote and clouded, beyond even the possibility of hope. What victory does God give to those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ? What has the victorious Christ to say to those whom war-weariness and despair threaten to engulf?

1. What has the victorious Christ to say about the world? 'In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.' In the Incarnation, God, in Christ, challenged the powers of evil to do their worst; and they did. They wrought the foulest deed in the long, dark history of man's sin. They killed the well-beloved Son. They staked their all on a last, desperate bid to win the mastery of the world; and, as we awaken to the glory of Easter Day, we realize that they have failed. Christ is victor. The rule of the Lord God Omnipotent is confirmed. As John Knox once wrote, in a previous time of trouble, 'Satan and those opposing God, may, with His permission, trouble and afflict the bodies of His children, but their souls are preserved unto eternal life, and the cause for which they fight shall in the end triumph, in spite of Satan and all his legions.' As we stand at the empty tomb, we know that the ultimate victory of Truth and Goodness and Love is certain. This is the faith, and this is the confidence which we Christians should be showing to the world. Christ has conquered. It is not a hope or a desire, a promise or an expectation. It is a fact, and we need only look forward to its final consummation. Even when the worst news comes over the wireless we can go on undismayed, putting forth our utmost effort, knowing that nothing that is done in obedience to God's command is ever wasted or thrown away. We need never be anxious or fearful, for our confidence is not in the strength of our arms, or even in the spirit of our people, but in Almighty God, who, in Christ, has already challenged and defeated the power of the devil. We rejoice this Easter Day not only at Christ's victory over the grave but also at the assurance of the final victory He yet shall win. 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.' Thanks be to God, which giveth us this victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ! As His instrument in the winning of this victory God has chosen the Church, and so we may ask:

2. 'What has the victorious Christ to say about the Church?' To us it may seem incredible that God should have entrusted the redemption of His world to such a broken and divided human society. But the Church is far more than that. She is the invisible fellowship of those who believe in Christ, and to such He has said, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' The Church, Paul tells us, is the body of Christ; and on Easter Day we see Christ's body risen, radiant, imperishable, and indestructible. Moreover have we not His own word for it that, against His Church, the gates of hell shall not prevail.

David once moved the ark of the Lord. As the oxen shook the cart which bore it, Uzzah put out his hand to steady the sacred thing, and suffered death for thus doubting God's power to take care of His own. The Church is on the move now. She is changing and must change. To many she seems to be shaken. Let us beware of Uzzah's sin. God will protect His own ark of salvation. We need not rush frenziedly to patch and mend the Church, nor devise schemes for her survival. She is not of our creation nor of our preservation. She is the body of Christ and cannot die. Avoiding both slavish conservatism and feverish lust for change, we can go forward in the Church, unafraid; ready for any alterations or even revolutions, so long as they are in accordance with the will of Him, who is the only Head and King of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ. In Him we have the assurance that she will remain until the end of the world His chosen vehicle of salvation for the weary souls of men. Thanks be to God which giveth us this victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!

Yet no matter how sure it makes us of the ultimate victory of the Good, no matter how certain of the indestructibility of the Church, Easter's glory would be dimmed for many these days, but for the assurance that it gives of the life everlasting. And so we may ask:

3. 'What has the victorious Christ to say about the individual?' 'I ascend,' He said, 'unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God.' 'I go to prepare a place for you.' Once I took the funeral of a friendless pauper.

It was a drab, chilly day, and the poor coffin was bundled into the common grave in an atmosphere of neglect and decay. I said the words of the committal. At the same moment a miracle happened. The sun broke through, and a skylark soared towards the tiny patch of blue, making the air throb with her defiance of death. Then came the words, 'I am the resurrection, and the life,' saith the Lord, 'he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.' Of all the gifts of the Risen Christ, those which are, perhaps, the most precious to us in this world of sorrow and perplexity are the blessed assurance of immortality, and the knowledge that our salvation depends not on our own weak efforts but on His abounding grace. 'Those that Thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost.' Surely when this realization breaks upon us we cannot help but cry, 'Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!'

Like all good preachers, Paul finishes with an application, 'Be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.' All service men know the after-leave feeling, the grim realization that for months there will be only sweet memories and letters instead of the home for which they long. But, if they are wise, they soon cease repining and put their whole effort into the struggle for victory which will mean 'Home for good.' So with us. Having rested awhile this Easter in the thought of what God has done for us in Christ, and will do, let us return to the labours of our several callings, with energy redoubled and with enthusiasm renewed; not doubtful of the outcome, or fearful of the end, but certain of the victory; of that victory which overcometh the world; of the victory of Christ and of His body, the Church; and of the victory of the free grace of God in our own lives. Then when the trumpets shall have sounded for the last, like weary warriors returned, we shall come Home—to light and love and everlasting life.

First Sunday after Easter.

The Promise of Easter.

'Thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself: for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.'—Is 60^{20}.

Listening to this prophet, you realize at once that he is standing on the topmost summit of hope and exultation. In his vision the day of deliverance has already dawned, and he is summoning the Hebrew folk, so long crushed and frustrated in exile, to renew in prospect their possession of their beloved Jerusalem.

In passages like this the Old Testament reaches the zenith of its prophetic witness and almost attains to the heights of the revelation of God in Christ. Its glowing faith in the power of the living God to work His will and to fulfil His purpose is the Old Testament prelude to the exulting faith in God and in life with which the Resurrection of Jesus filled the writers of the New Testament. Few things in the Bible are as familiar to us as the great sentences in which they utter the faith and confidence with which their Lord's triumph had filled them. And nowhere is familiarity more dangerous.

There are some memorable sentences of Jean Paul Richter, quoted long ago by Thomas Carlyle, in which he describes the power of an old truth to reveal itself anew to the mind and heart of him who believes it. 'A man,' he says, 'may for twenty years believe the immortality of the soul; in the one-and-twentieth, in some great moment, he for the first time discovers with amazement the rich meaning of this belief, the warmth of this naphtha well.'

A Christian will readily recognize in this his own experience; and something like this we must pray for, as we listen again this Eastertide to those scriptures which have borne the torch of the Resurrection faith down the centuries to nearly sixty generations of Christian men and women. When St. Paul and the other apostles are speaking about the Resurrection, they can hardly refrain from breaking into song. 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.'

Yet they lived in no easy, ideal world. Over their writings there hangs no roseate vision that tempts them to forget the stark, actual scene which confronts them. Like ours, their world was a world of death and sin and conflict; unlike us, they were members of what seemed to be an insignificant society, without power or prestige; and they were preaching what to any rational observer who did not share their secret could only appear to be the adventure of a forlorn hope.

Never in the world of men before or since, except among those who have shared their faith, has there been anything like this. Exasperated foes of Christianity from every conceivable standpoint have minimized their witness and have scornfully explained it away. But there it stands in the New Testament.

There have been others in the past who, in face of the dangers and tragedies of world-failure, have cherished the hope and preached the promise of man's ultimate emergence from darkness into a state of blessedness and peace. In spite of the warnings of science, which declines to affirm that there is any principle of inevitable progress at work in the world, the human soul has never failed to respond to voices that have pledged the credit of the universe to outgrow all that is base and irrational and cruel in it. There is an undying instinct in man's spirit which defies appearances and clings to the possibility of final arrival after his long wanderings. And if indeed men are the children of a righteous, loving God, it is natural for them to believe this, unless sin and suffering have destroyed the divine image within them.

But this instinctive faith, which apart from Christianity is the only thing that can keep civilization from falling to pieces, is a very different thing from Christian faith about life in the light of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. Whence did that conviction arise? Why are Christians who are true to themselves and to their faith in their Lord so sure of God and of the issues of world-chaos and upheaval? In the answer to those questions we touch the very core of the gospel of the Resurrection of Jesus. The greatest thing in that gospel is not that it reveals eternal life conquering death, but that it reveals the sovereign love and righteousness of God. 'Christianity,' says an American writer, 'is a religion which transcends tragedy. Tears, with death, are swallowed up in victory. The Cross is not tragic, but the resolution of tragedy. Here suffering is carried into the very life of God and overcome.' We know this, because God raised Jesus from the dead and vindicated His sacrifice in His Resurrection.

Towards the end of the war of 1914–1918, when many were feeling its heavy pressure upon mind and heart, a writer who had already done great service in interpreting Christianity to his generation, Professor David Cairns, wrote a book with the title, *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*. Only the morally and spiritually eccentric, he urges, can doubt the power and beauty of the teaching of Jesus Christ as it is recorded in the Gospels. But is it true? In such a world as this, is it real? He quotes a great historian of the ancient world, Mommsen, who closes his history by saying: 'The world was growing old, and not even Cæsar could make it young again.' The miracle of Christianity, says Dr. Cairns, is that it was that situation which witnessed the amazing upspringing of new life and hope and gladness that appears upon the scene in the New Testament. What Cæsar was unable to do, Christ has done. And how? Because the Church believed, and none could shake them in their faith, that, in Jesus risen, it had arrived at the very heart of things, that 'Christ is no mere episode in our human story, but history's very heart and soul.'

And so, bringing to its conclusion his close-knit argument, this writer sums up in a memorable phrase the Easter gospel of hope for the world through the Resurrection: 'this is a Christ world.'

This indeed is a creed that puts iron into the blood, gives power to the will, and breathes peace into the heart. The world of our time is shaking and cracking around us, and sometimes in those moments when we lose the vision of the risen Christ, if we told our weak, unworthy thoughts about it, we should have to confess that it looks like a devil-ridden world, a defeated world, a lost world, a mammon world, or a world with any other adjective that describes the effect of the sins and cruelties which are bruising the hopes and wounding the heart of mankind. But then upon our faithless depression there breaks again the message of the Resurrection with its *Sursum Corda*: Lift up your hearts! Here are still the conflict, the blindness, the evil, which we mourn in ourselves and which afflict the world we live in; and here still are the personal sorrows, bereavements, frustrations which make for so many the bitterness of life. But Jesus lives, and sin and death are under His feet.

'For who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or the sword?' I think that if he were preaching to us, St. Paul would translate his own words into terms of our own time: 'Shall war or air-raids, or massacres, or red revolutions, or dictators, or State tyranny, or mammon-worship, or vested interests, or whatsoever else may be your world's negation of God?'

'Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us.[1]

[1] F. B. Macnutt, in *Festival Sermons*, 63.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

The Moabite Occupation of Jericho.

Professor Garstang, in his evidence from the excavation of Jericho, has been able to throw considerable light on a passage in Jg 3^{12-14}, where we read: 'The Lord strengthened Eglon the king of Moab against Israel. . . . And he gathered unto him the children of Ammon and Amalek, and went and smote Israel, and possessed the city of palm trees. And the children of Israel served Eglon the king of Moab eighteen years.' In a reconsideration of the special pottery found in considerable quantity in association with the structure called the Middle Building (which stood isolated on the small mound overlooking the spring),[1] he has found it necessary to revise the date which he had suggested for these painted wares. Instead of placing them, as he has tentatively done hitherto, in the first half of the Late

[1] Garstang, *The Story of Jericho*, pl. xvi, a.

Bronze Age (*c.* 1600–1400 B.C.), he now ascribes them, as the excavators of Beth-shean have done in the case of the same type of pottery, to the second half of that Age, particularly to the period beginning with the reign of Pharaoh Seti I (*c.* 1322–1301 B.C.). Consequently, the Middle Building, instead of being, as was supposed, the residence of the last kings of Jericho at the time of the city's destruction by Joshua about 1400 B.C., must now be placed about eighty years later. This would seem at first sight to raise a serious difficulty, for according to Jos $6^{21ff.}$ Joshua totally destroyed the city and laid it under a ban, and it was not till the reign of Ahab (*c.* 875 B.C.) that it was rebuilt. As Garstang points out, however, the revised date of the pottery coincides with that of the Moabite king's attack on Israel and his occupation of the site (which Garstang places about 1320 B.C. onwards) referred to in the above text, thus affording important archæological evidence bearing on the Biblical narrative. Here, in this intrusive kind of residence, with its hearth and oven, and its strong surrounding wall, King Eglon no doubt lived part of the time every year, probably for the collection of the yearly tribute, until Ehud brought the Moabite supremacy to an end by assassinating him after eighteen years of subjection (Jg $3^{15ff.}$). That King Eglon was in residence here at the time of his death seems evident from the fact that Ehud, after feigning departure from the King's house, only went as far as the 'sculptured stones' ('graven images,' Jg 3^{19} R.V.m.) at Gilgal, a place (modern *Jiljûlieh*) not more than two miles from Jericho, and then turned back to do the deed.

Professor Garstang has determined the date of the Moabite aggression by calculating downward from 1400 B.C. (the approximate time when Jericho fell), but there is another, perhaps surer, method which leads to the same result. Cushan-rishathaim, who oppressed the Israelites for eight years not long after their entrance into the land (Jg $3^{8ff.}$), was undoubtedly Artatama II of Mitanni (Aram), who was a Cushite,[1] and acted at the instigation of the Hittites, who opposed the Hebrew penetration. This king's first year of reign is given by Sidney Smith, the well-known authority on Mesopotamia, as 1367 B.C., and he is believed to have reigned for eight years (the very period of the oppression). If we allow for these eight years together with the forty years of peace which followed (Jg 3^{11}), we come down to 1319 B.C., just after the beginning of Seti's reign, for Eglon's attack on Israel and his capture of Jericho. The eighteen years of Moabite occupation of this city thus fall within this Pharaoh's reign, the very period to which Professor Garstang and the Beth-shean excavators now ascribe the particular pottery referred to.

[1] The Septuagint, for instance, has Χουσαρσαθαιμ, where Χοῦς is meant for Kûsh, and 'Αρσαθαιμ according to well-known Greek rules is 'Αρταταίμ (cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lii. 115). The αι in the termination is a Greek dialectical form of ᾱ (cf. καίω for κάω, αἰεί for ἀεί, θναίσκω for θνάσκω, αἰετός for ἀετός, etc.).

PATRIARCHAL PALESTINE.

In our article of June, 1939 (p. 406), we referred to some texts written in cursive hieratic on figurines or statuettes, several hundred in number, which had lain forgotten in the Brussels Museum, and which contain lists of names of towns and individuals in Palestine and neighbouring regions in the Patriarchal Age. Among the place-names occurring in the Old Testament we mentioned Aphek, Beth-shemesh, Hazor, Jerusalem, Migdal, and Shechem. The texts have now been further examined by G. Posener (the original decipherer), Professor Albrecht Alt, and Professor Albright. Their date has been definitely fixed as sometime between 1860 and 1800 B.C. (according to Albright between 1850 and 1825, in the first half of the reign of Amenemmes III). They help us, therefore, to fill in the picture of the geography and ethnology of Palestine as it was in the days of Isaac and Jacob, and mention many towns which we know from the Old Testament were in existence at that early period. 'The new data,' says Professor Albright, 'complement the results of local excavation in the happiest way.'[2] In addition to the names of towns mentioned above, given in our previous article, the following have now been deciphered:

Aksapa = Achshaph (*Tell Kisân*), whose king joined Jabin's confederacy and was slain (Jos 11^{1} 12^{20}).

'Ky = Accho (*'Akka* or *Acre*), one of the towns of Asher (Jg 1^{31}).

Arḥâbum = Reḥôb (*Tell eṣ-Ṣârem*, near Beth-shean ?), the farthest north place reached by Moses' spies (Nu 13^{21}).

'Astartum = 'Ashtaroth in Bashan (*Tell 'Ashtarah*), captured from King Og by the Israelites (Dt 1^{4}, Jos 9^{10}, etc.).

'Ayyânu = Ijon (*Merj 'Ayûn*, north-west of Dan), which was taken by Ben-hadad (1 K 15^{20}, 2 Ch 16^{4}).

Helam = Helam, north of Gilead, where David defeated an Aramæan army (2 S 10^{16}).

Kn' = Kûn (*Kuna*, near *Bereitân*), a town despoiled by David (1 Ch 18^{8}, 2 S 8^{8}).

[2] *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 83, p. 36.

Lus(i) =Laish (*Tell el-Kâdî*), the original name of the town of Dan, at one of the sources of the Jordan (Jg $18^{7.\ 29}$).

Mishal =Mishal in Asher (Jos 19^{26}), given to the Gershonite Levites.

Qani =Ḳanah (*Ḳana*), south-east of Tyre, in the northern boundary of Asher (Jos 19^{28}).

Ṣurrûyu =Tyre (*Ṣur*), assigned at the Conquest to Asher (Jos 19^{29}), but perhaps never occupied by them.

Šutu =Ancient name of Moab according to Albright, who bases his view on Nu 24^{17}, where he translates Hebrew *St* as Šutu, instead of Sheth or 'tumult.'

Ships of Tarshish.

It is well known that in Old Testament times Phœnicia, and especially the city of Tyre, whose maritime influence was predominant, founded important colonies along the Mediterranean seaboard, even beyond the 'Pillars of Hercules' (the Straits of Gibraltar). One of the most distant of these was Gades or Gadir (modern Cadiz) in western Spain, a few miles south of the embouchure of the Baetis river (now the Guadalquiver). According to some ancient writers it was about the eighth or ninth century B.C., and according to others (such as Velleius Paterculus, the Roman historian) about the twelfth, that the Phœnicians founded their colony here. It was at this place that they procured the metal that abounded in Spain (cf. the Rio Tinto mines of the present day), and from here their ships sailed to places on the north-west coast and to the Cassiterides or Scilly Islands, to be loaded with tin and other metals. They gave the name of 'Tarshish' (Roman Tartessus, Greek Τάρτησσος) first to Gades and then to the whole of this Spanish region. The name occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and appears in one of Esarhaddon's texts (*c.* 681 B.C.) discovered at Assur (*Qala'at-Shergat*), as well as in a Phœnician inscription found at Nora in Sardinia and dating (according to Albright) some time between 925 and 825 B.C. The theory that the name Tarshish refers to the Etruscans (a piratical people known to the ancient Egyptians as *Tursha*) has little to uphold it; and the idea that it is to be identified (as is done by Josephus) with the Cilician Tarsus has small support among scholars.

On account of the colony's distance from the home-land, the name came by and by to be used only in a vague sense to signify merely the extreme west, the farthest-off region that Phœnician commerce had reached. When Jonah endeavoured to escape as far as possible from Yahweh's land, it was to Tarshish that he sought to flee (Jon 1^{3} 4^{2}). It was the place where the classical poets imagined that the sun unharnessed its tired horses.

Probably the name, as Haupt suggested as far back as 1902, and as Professor Albright has recently pointed out,[1] was a Phœnician word denoting 'mine' or 'smelting plant,' and is explained by Albright as a loan from Babylonian, being a *taf'îl* noun formed from *rašâšu*, 'to melt,' 'to be smelted.' Tarshish was thus a mining region, where smelted metal was procurable—silver, tin, iron, lead (Jer 10^{9}, Ezk 27^{12}), reminding us of the copper refinery of the tenth-ninth centuries at Ezion-geber on the Gulf of Aqabah, and probably conducted like it by means of slave labour; and the expression 'Ships of Tarshish' (*'oniyôth taršiš*: 1 K 22^{48}, Ps 48^{7}, Is 2^{16} $23^{1.\ 14}$ 60^{9}, Ezk 27^{25}; *'onî taršiš*: 1 K 10^{22}) was used primarily to denote the large sea-going vessels which went there from Phœnicia and returned with their valuable cargoes. In 1914 Dr. G. Contineau discovered a sarcophagus at Sidon, bearing, as he thinks, a representation of such a vessel.[2] These naval expeditions to this remote region must have begun as early as 1000 B.C., for this was probably about the time when Gades, Utica near Carthage, and some other Phœnician colonies were founded. The expeditions must have developed largely during the reign of Hiram I of Tyre (*c.* 969–936 B.C.) who co-operated with Solomon in the latter's naval enterprise at Ezion-geber. Later on, in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., the Phocæan Greeks entered into competition with the Phœnicians for the colonization of Tarshish and other districts of Spain. The Assyrians also, though far away from the western Mediterranean, were evidently interested in Tarshish and aware of its location there. Esarhaddon's text, to which we have referred, speaks of 'the kings who are in the midst of the sea (*i.e.* in the isles of the Mediterranean), all of them, from the land of *Ia-da-na-na*, the land of *Ia-man*, as far as the land of *Tar-ši-ši*.' Here *Iadanana* (=Cyprus) and *Iaman* (=Hebrew *Iawan*, *i.e.* Ionia) form the *terminus a quo* in the eastern Mediterranean, while *Tarshish* clearly represents the *terminus ad quem* in the west.

Naturally, in the course of time, the expression 'Ships of Tarshish' came to signify any large merchant vessels fit for a long journey (cf. our term 'East Indiaman,' and the French 'Paquebot transatlantique' which does not necessarily sail the Atlantic). In this non-geographical sense the expression was applied to Solomon's ships (*c.* 950 B.C.) which went down the Red Sea from

[1] *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 83, p. 41.

[2] *La civilization phénicienne* (1926), 23, 297.

Ezion-geber to Ophir (1 K 9^{26-28} 10^{22}, 2 Ch 9^{21}), and to those of Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah which were also intended for the same enterprise (1 K 22^{48}, 2 Ch 20^{36}). These Israelite ships were largely manned by Phœnicians, and though sailing eastward appear to have been rigged and manned after the manner of the Phœnician ones to Spain. In these Israelite cases, however, the author or compiler of the Chronicles seems not to have understood the nautical expression, for he interpreted it literally under the idea that the Ezion-geber vessels actually sailed to Tarshish (2 Ch 9^{21} 20^{36}).

Israelite Horticulture.

For the ordinary cereal crops the rainfalls were usually sufficient, but it was different in the case of vegetable and fruit gardens, which could easily be affected by the drought of summer. The cultivation of these required some system of artificial irrigation (cf. Is 1^{30}). Owing to the hilly nature of the country there were no canals, such as existed in the Egyptian Delta and the low-lying plains of Mesopotamia, and there were really no perennial streams of water to help. Even the Jordan was little use owing to its constant change in volume and its high banks. The Israelites, in their garden cultivation, had to be content like the Canaanites, with the water from the springs which supplied their villages and towns. With careful ingenuity, they usually managed to lead water either directly from the spring or from some raised reservoir (containing collected rain-water), and to circulate it along little channels ramifying through all parts of the garden (cf. Is 58^{11}).

1. Vegetables.—We have little information as to these or their variety. No doubt, the Israelites found in Canaan, or introduced there, the various products of Egypt which they had missed in the desert (Nu 11^{5}), such as water-melons (*abâṭṭiḥim*), cucumbers (*qiššûim*), leeks (*ḥâṣir*, a word which etymologically means 'green grass' or 'herbage'), onions (*beṣâlim*), garlic (*šumim*). To these may be added the different kinds of lettuce and endive which entered into the composition of the 'bitter herbs' (*merôrim*) used with the Passover lamb (Ex 12^{8}, Nu 9^{11}). In addition, a few aromatic plants and spices were cultivated.

2. Fruit Trees.—Not only orchards but well-irrigated gardens containing fruit trees and fruit bushes were common everywhere. They were valued so highly that the Code of Deuteronomy required them to be spared when a city was beseiged (Dt 20^{19}), in contrast to the reckless procedure of an earlier age (2 K $3^{19.\ 25}$). Their beautiful foliage gave an exuberant appearance to many villages, and their cool shade made them a welcome place of resort (Est 7^{7}, Ca 4^{16}), as well as a pleasant retreat for idlers and *far niente* people.

The 'garden of herbs' (*gan yaraq*, Dt 11^{10}, 1 K 21^{2}) was really a pleasure garden as well as a kitchen garden and orchard, and hence was sometimes described by Hebrew writers as a *pardês* ('paradise'), which is a loan-word of Zend (Aryan) origin (cf. Ca 4^{13} R.V.m.; Ne 2^{8}, where A.V. and R.V. translate it 'forest,' and R.V.m. 'park'; Ec 2^{5}, A.V. 'orchards,' R.V. 'parks'). Among the varieties which grew in such an enclosure, Canticles in particular refers several times to a tree called *tappûaḥ*, which our translators on the analogy of the Arabic word *tuffaḥ*, have rendered 'apple-tree' or 'apple' (Ca $2^{3.\ 5}$ 7^{8} 8^{5}, Pr 25^{11}, Joel 1^{12}). This tree, however, has always been of poor growth in Palestine, apart from the Lebanon. Its native fruit is stunted and wanting in sweetness, and consequently scholars have suggested that the Biblical writers meant the quince, or the apricot, or the citron-tree, though this last is certainly of more recent introduction. It is clear at least that the tree to which allusion is made bore fruit of a strong fragrant odour and of a brilliant golden colour (cf. 'apples of gold in baskets of silver,' Pr 25^{11}).

The commonest tree was the fig-tree, which grew abundantly on the lower terraces of orchards and in the more sheltered parts of vineyards, and whose 'sweetness' and 'good fruit' are extolled in Jotham's parable (Jg 9^{11}). It gives early figs in spring before the leaves appear (cf. Jer 24^{2} 'figs of early ripeness'; also Is 28^{4} R.V., Hos 9^{10}, Mic 7^{1}). They are regarded as a special delicacy, but a great number of them soon fall (cf. Nah 3^{12}). The real fruit does not become abundant till summer, and is not gathered for immediate use or drying till August or September. It can then be pressed in a mould to form 'cakes of figs' (1 S 25^{18} 30^{12}, 2 K 20^{7} R.V., 1 Ch 12^{40}), as was done in Egypt from very early times. The sycomore-tree (*šiqmah*), which belongs to the fig family and was very abundant in ancient Palestine (1 K 10^{27}, Is 9^{10}), grows at the present day mostly in the sandy soil of the Shephelah (especially round Jaffa) and in the oasis of the Ghôr. It bears an abundance of rather tasteless figs, but furnishes useful wood. For the purpose of ripening the fruit and removing any bitterness, an incision is often made into it. The prophet Amos lived partly by this occupation ('I was a dresser of sycomore-trees,' Am 7^{14} R.V.). In Egypt excavators have discovered votive offerings in faience representing sycomore figs which have undergone this treatment.

Various other fruit trees were cultivated. In Ca 6^{11} we have mention of the walnut tree (*égôz*,

Arab. *jauz*), which was probably introduced from Asia Minor, and the African pomegranate-tree (*rimmôn*) which was very common. In Gn 43^{11} R.V.m. we have a reference to the pistachio-tree (*boṭnah*), which produced a kind of oval-shaped nuts, one of the articles carried down to Egypt by the sons of Jacob as a present to Joseph, and still a delicacy in Palestine and Egypt. In Gn 30^{37} R.V., the almond-tree (*lûz*), whose fruit was a great favourite, is mentioned among those growing in the region of Harran in Mesopotamia, though the A.V. wrongly translates it 'hazel.' On account of its early waking out of winter's sleep and thus showing beautiful white blossoms in January, it was given the name of *šāqēd*, 'the watcher' (as in Gn 43^{11}, Nu 17^{8}, Jer 1^{11}; and also Ec 12^{5} where its flower is compared to the white hair of old age).

In 2 S 5^{23} and Ps 84^{6} there is reference to a tree called *bakâ*, which seems to have grown to some extent in the western outskirts of Jerusalem. In the former text the A.V. takes it to be the 'mulberry-tree,' while in the latter the R.V. translates it 'weeping' (from *bākah*, 'to weep') and in the margin puts 'balsam tree.' According to D. Yellin [1] it was probably the nettle-tree, which produces a soft globose fruit and still grows near Jerusalem. At all events the mulberry-tree, whose berries were used to make a favourite beverage (cf. 1 Mac 6^{34}), was not introduced into Palestine till post-Exilic times, and the same must be said of the sycamine-tree (black mulberry), and the citron-tree, whose fruit (*etrungâ* or *etrôg*) entered largely into the ritual of the second temple during the Feast of Tabernacles,[2] while the banana-tree and the orange-tree were not introduced till later still, after the Mussulman Conquest.

The palm-tree or date-palm (*tāmār*) deserves special mention, as it was sacred to the Semites, and its fruit formed a staple diet, as we learn from the Mishnah. It was abundant around Jericho, the 'city of palm trees' (Dt 34^{3}, Jg 1^{16} 3^{13}, 2 Ch 28^{15}). Many specimens still grow in the narrow, sheltered, and well-watered valleys leading down to the Dead Sea and to the Arabah. These regions, especially those fed by the abundant waters of the *Wadi Quelt* and the stream *'Ain es-Sultân*, contrasted with the sterile marly soil which covered the greater part of the Ghôr and gave it such a desolate aspect (cf. Gn 13^{10}, where the well-watered districts in the 'Circle of Jordan' [R.V.m.] are compared to the 'garden of the Lord').

[1] *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society*, iii. 191.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.*, iii. 10, 4, xiii. 13, 5.

Contributions and Comments.

Hosanna: The Word of the Joyful Jerusalem Crowds.

Two recent contributions to The Expository Times have brought this word once more to the fore.[1] Is it possible to make yet *another suggestion* against the background of a phrase in Mr. Wood's contribution; and the very much more striking (and rather overlooked) sentence of J. H. Thayer in *H.D.B.*?

Mr. Wood asks 'why commentators refuse to translate the words literally.' The Article in *H.D.B.* pertinently remarks that 'to find the explanation of *either word or act* in the psalm (118) and its use, involves the N.T. interpreter in grave embarrassments.' [2] True certainly; for is it not rash to argue that because the crowd on the occasion of the Triumphal Entry used the material contained in Ps 118^{26a}, they must also have used that of ^{25}, when ^{26b} could also have suited their purpose? As a matter of fact, crowds—more particularly in matters of 'community singing'—do or say what their leaders tell them; and, in cases of this kind, as Jerusalem (modern) has certainly learned more than once these past years, the verses to which the crowds give vent, are, as often as not, *the spontaneous and impromptu improvisations of local poets*. This has long been a Semitic characteristic. There are no necessarily regular ejaculations at the annual procession of Nabi Musa in spring-time. True this procession goes in the opposite direction—down towards Jericho—but it is difficult not to think that it may have had some connexion originally with the Palm Sunday processions of the Christian Churches. The material, however, meted out to the Nabi Musa crowd is not only (sometimes too) topical, but is usually short and so easily remembered and taught by continuous repetition. Sometimes, of course, the verse may contain a well-known quotation, as was the case at the Triumphal Entry; more than that—the whole enterprise does give every impression of spontaneity; from the saddle to the song it was one glorious bit of improvisation! We should never lose sight of this fact.

The Article in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* [3] makes

[1] Nov., 1940; June, 1941.

[2] *H.D.B.*, ii. 418.

[3] Vol. vi. 476.

one claim in common with some commentators, which is surely right, even though most of the material is not in line with N.T. criticism. The right point is that 'Hosanna in the Highest' makes no sense, as it stands now.

The other contention that Mark is a combination of Matthew and Luke would scarcely be endorsed to-day—still less that John is the original. John may have had an original detail or two, as that Jesus did not mount the ass [1] till after the acclamation of the crowds, but the main point here again is the renewed emphasis on spontaneity. *The Markan version of the cry of the multitude must surely be the original*; both Matthew and Luke appear to have been editing, for 'Son of David' is distinctly Matthean; while Luke, through omitting 'Hosanna' perhaps as an Aramaism, has not complicated the issue for the interpreters. Possibly, however, it was not because he thought it an Aramaism that he left it out, but because he took 'Hosanna' as the equivalent of δόξα. So also the Arabic version of the Diatessaron with تسبيح. Once again this makes sense, and in both occurrences of the word. Mr. Wood, too, makes sense, though he does not mention that Dr. Torrey translates it in his version of the scene in Matthew and Mark precisely as he does himself, while Weymouth got very close to the idea.

But does this rendering really satisfy all the references, especially the occurrences of the word alone in Mark and John? It must have meant something *by itself* as well as in construction. We therefore come back to the psalm quotation and ask whether the orthodox meaning ascribed to the word supplies what is needed. Something to do with 'salvation'? Yes! but the Hiphil Imperative hardly meets the situation so far as actual construction is concerned, even though the idea be the one naturally anticipated. If St. Luke looked up the LXX to see how it was rendered, he apparently decided against making any use of σῶσον δή. How could he? The crux of the problem seems to be that, if 'Hosanna' stands for הוֹשִׁיעָ־נָא, it does not really make sense in either clause in Mark and only in the first in Matthew; and it is not everybody who seems to agree even here! Some interpreters would have a Hebrew and others an Aramaic origin, but the fact of the 'rough breathing' in Greek would seem to make the balance of probability in favour of Hebrew.[2] Hosea, for another instance, is similarly given a rough breathing in the LXX. Arabic on the other hand follows the Aramaic with اوصنا. We can hardly be surprised if Luke was content to paraphrase, as it were, with δόξα; and that his example has been followed by not a few since.

There does not seem to have been much discrepancy in the spelling of 'Hosanna' among the MSS. It is true that L has only one ν: and that D has ο to start with, followed by σσ. But this slight variation only makes the accepted spelling all the more impressive. It was indeed a word with a *ring* in it, which quickly found its way into favour and into common use. Its appearance in the Didache is proof enough of this in Christian circles after its baptism into the Gospel pages. But there is not simply the rough breathing which makes the word interesting—there is the νν. In accordance with the customary interpretation it was the second ν which represented the enclitic נָא, which became δή in the LXX. Where, however, did the first come from? Is it just due to the *daghesh* in the Hebrew, when נָא is not joined by a *maqqeph*? Or is it to be accounted for by a coalescence of the preceding ע in the shorter form of the *Hiphil* Imperative? This is not very convincing, since the Greeks apparently used rather short shrift in dealing with the guttural letters which they could not pronounce. Both ח and ע seem to have come in for their full share of this rejection. The two Arabic names in the New Testament have suffered in the same way.[3] On the other hand, they are names and not expressions. The retention of the rough breathing in this case may be all the more remarkable. It would be worth while finding out how many cases can be found for the Greeks doubling one of the letters of a 'Greek-ised' word in order to make recompense for a letter from another language, which they could not pronounce: ἀῤῥαβῶν is certainly a case to the contrary, but the combination of ע with ר does invite a doubled ρ for its pronunciation.[4] As a rule the line of least resistance is usually followed—still is, even in these modern and less excusable days!

This brings us to the main question as to *whether in the first place the second ν in 'Hosanna' might not be the first person plural nominal suffix.* This would make the first ν stand for the final radical of a noun. The first person suffix so attached could only imply 'possession.' Something like 'Our Salvation' is naturally required to make good sense. But can this be possible? This is the second main point. The suggestion therefore resolves itself into whether the rough breathing and the two following letters could represent some nounal form of the Semitic root חסך, common to Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. In spite of the dictionaries surely the corresponding Arabic root here is حصن, which gives the same meaning of 'stronghold,' as in Am 2[9]. There is still a place of that name in Transjordan, not far from Irbid, where the C.M.S. has had a mission station for many years. In Arabic the root means to be 'inaccessible,' then come various means of fortifications, right down to one of the ordinary words for 'horse' as the emblem of strength. There is, too, the other meaning of the Hebrew root given as 'treasure,' the corresponding Arabic being خزن, whence comes مخزن 'storehouse,' coming into English as 'magazine.' There would seem to have

[1] The Mufty, perhaps significantly, certainly of set purpose, used to ride a horse at the Nabi Musa procession.

[2] *Vide H.D.B. ad loc.*

[3] Elymas (Ac 13[8]) and Arctas (2 Co 11[32]).

[4] Gn 38[17]: 1 Co 1[22].

been a wealth of ideas in the Hebrew-Aramaic root. What if הוֹשַׁנְּנָא could lie behind Hosanna? The Arabic حصنّنا is very resounding. There are references in plenty to Jehovah being a 'strong tower' or 'strength.' The O.T. does not have to be combed to bring this out. At the time of the Triumphal Entry it was by no means dead; the powers and strength of God after all have never been on the decline where simpler minds are concerned. Could it be therefore that there is at the back of Hosanna a Semitic word meaning something along the line of 'Our strength,' 'stronghold,' 'abundance of salvation,' 'treasure' even? 'Our stronghold is (in) the Son of David.' 'Our strength is in the highest.' 'Our stronghold; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' 'A safe stronghold our God is still.'

ERIC F. F. BISHOP.

Newman School of Missions,
Thabor, Jerusalem.

Entre Nous.

Luke xxi. 19.

'In the most familiar of all passages for reading in war time the version in St. Luke of our Lord's great discourse which begins, "Nation shall rise against nation, kingdom against kingdom," the first section ends with words which are differently translated in the Authorized and in the Revised Versions of the Bible. The difference is highly significant; it represents two contrasted methods of meeting calamity, and implies two incompatible forms of religion.

'The older rendering is the familiar, "In your patience possess ye your souls," which in its more colloquial form "possess your soul in patience" was the answer of parents and pastors a generation ago to the eagerness and anticipations of the young. "Wait quietly: the good time will come eventually: it is not here yet; and you cannot hurry it." "Sit still, O men of God: your efforts are vanity and vexation of spirit: God brings in the Kingdom in His own good time: trust Him and be patient." For our own day Dr. Barth and his followers have echoed the precept of Victorian nurseries with a curiously similar speciousness. It looks so reverent, so humble, so entirely seemly for the children of Adam to sit with hands folded and eyes upraised, possessing their meagre and masochistic souls in patience, meditating upon man's fallen state and infinite futility, and denouncing with an air of exasperating superiority those who cannot so easily disavow the responsibilities of their citizenship or of their calling as in some sort "workers together with God."

'"In your patience ye shall win your souls" is the version of the Revisers—and like most of their work it represents as close an approximation to the tradition as is compatible with scholarship. It is pitifully lukewarm. "In your fortitude you will achieve the captaincy of your souls," is what the verse requires. For it is a message not of consolation but of encouragement, a summons to achievement rather than a call to endurance. This is clear not only from the Greek of the verse itself, but from the parallelism of the second section of the discourse. There, "when men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking on the things which are coming on the earth," we are bidden to see the Son of Man in glory, and to lift up our hearts since our redemption is at hand.

'To face calamity not in the spirit of a meek acceptance or of a stoic and Red Indian impassibility but as a challenge to discovery and an opportunity for advancement—such is the message of Jesus and such surely the spirit in which Christians should face this day of visitation. It is not for us to put our religion into cold storage for the duration; to say as so many are saying, we cannot be Christian in war time, or we must wait till the war is won for any fulfilment of our hope. Rather it is here and now, in the furnace, that the Son of God is discovered.'[1]

Service of Youth.

In October, 1939, the Board of Education launched the Service of Youth. The object was to draw young people between fourteen and twenty who were outside any organization into some healthy form of corporate life. This was done in two ways. The first was to offer help in money and equipment to existing movements so that they might extend their work. The second method was to provide alternative organizations for those young people who would not associate themselves with the existing Church or any Christian organizations.

The Rev. Hugh C. Warner, Vicar of Epsom, has written a small book (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net) in which he surveys the subject of *Christian Youth Leadership* in Clubs and Youth Centres. One chapter is devoted to an account of the Experimental Youth Centre at Epsom with which Mr. Warner himself is associated. Other chapters deal with the Present Situation, and they consider: Some Implications of Character Training; The Spiritual Basis for Youth Work; The Christian Background for Youth Work; and First Steps in the Christian Education of Youth. The book, which will be found of the greatest use, contains

[1] C. E. Raven, *Lessons of the Prince of Peace*, vii.

also a number of Appendices, including a classified Bibliography.

What are some of the steps that Mr. Warner has found successful in dealing with boys and girls from non-Christian homes and who themselves were often markedly antagonistic to any influence? He first gives a warning that exhortation is a mistake. Among his practical suggestions are the following:

The youth leader should have at his finger-tips the outline story at least of Christian social work. When social reform is being discussed the question will soon be asked, 'Well, what have the Churches ever done about it?' 'The answer will begin the process of corrosion, by which a youthful impatience with organized religion will be worn down as knowledge grows . . . a curiosity will be awakened into the nature of the Faith which has so inspired men.' In Appendix I. Mr. Warner gives a list of many social reforms which the spirit of Christ has achieved through Christian men and women.

Another suggestion as to how an interest in the Christian Faith may be stirred up is to make use of Youth Groups associated with the Churches. These are able to put on dramatic and cinema shows illustrating Christian themes. For example, a play illustrating the life of Livingstone, another descriptive of the adventures of St. Paul might be shown by them at the Youth Centre. The Youth Centre team would then in turn visit the church hall of the Youth Group and put over its particular entertainment. In this way the two types of members meet and a barrier of fear of the unknown is gone and much may happen.

Again, a discussion group on social questions and on the contribution of the Church to them may be started. Members are not interested if there is simply an announcement that such a Group will meet. The leader must start with what the members are interested in. One item will be film stars. 'Here is an excellent basis to start with. He suggests an evening when all members will bring photos of their favourite film stars, and be prepared to talk about their private lives. (This will not be as inquisitive as it may sound to the uninitiated, as the material for the purpose is plentiful!) Where this has actually been tried, it has been found that the subject of divorce very soon comes up! From a discussion on divorce it is an easy step to "What makes an unhappy home life?" The road is now wide open for a discussion on Unemployment, Slums (and what the Church has done about it), and the Raising of the School Age. "What's worth learning in school" may follow, and can introduce every subject under the sun, and there is sure to be some one with strong feelings about school prayers. "What's the use of Prayer?" etc., and the leader has the situation just where he needs it.'

Astrology.

'One of the queer facts about human nature is that in times of strain and calamity the old dark gods emerge from the jungle, and crude primitive religion comes back. . . . We to-day are threatened with it again in the prevailing cult of Astrology. . . .

'The religion of Christ can never come to terms with it, because ours is the religion of the Truth. Christianity lives in the daylight; it lives in a rational world of ordered law under the moral governance of God's will, ruled by His wisdom and guarded by His love, in which there is no room for blind caprice or for gross unmanning superstitions.

'It is not possible to believe in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to toy with the follies of Astrology. The things that happen in history and in our lives all proceed as effects from causes, but the stars "have nothing to do with the case" at all. Disaster is not more probable on Fridays, or because we can see Saturn in the sky, or for any other equally silly reason. If we believe in God we must not yield to it. The coming of Christ is the end of all such fears. "God has not given us the spirit of fearfulness but of love and power and a sound mind."' [1]

Ecce Homo.

'The Church believes that God was also a man. And this particular Man it has never been possible to identify with any social, political or economic system, or with any moral code. He seems literally all things to all men; to the rebel, a revolutionary; to the lover of political order, the sanction for the tribute paid to Cæsar; to the virtuous, the King of Virgins; to the sinner, the friend of harlots and publicans; to the pacifist, Prince of Peace; to the warrior, a sword in the earth; to the gentle, meek and lowly; to the impatient, armed with vituperation and the scourge of small cords; to the light-hearted, the guest at Cana; to the melancholy, the Man of Sorrows; to the once-born, simple as a little child; to the twice-born, rent in sunder in Gethsemane; to the humanist, perfect man; to the theologian, perfect God, filling all the categories and contained by none; and with all this, a single, recognizable, and complete Personality.' [2]

POETRY.

Arthur Guiterman wrote in the *New York Times* lately—

> While man has faith that good must conquer ill,
> While love and courage live, no force can still
> The voice of poetry.

However that may be this month is specially rich in poetry. The first volume in front of us, and the most important, is T. S. Eliot's *The Dry Salvages* (Faber & Faber; 1s. net). With this the trilogy begun by Burnt Norton and East Coker ends. This is a poem which must be read slowly, read and re-read to get at its significance—and even then some of the meaning may escape. The subject is the nature of timeless experience. The background is the strange and varied sea voices

[1] F. R. Barry, in the *Southwell Diocesan Magazine*.
[2] Dorothy Sayers, in *Malvern, 1941*.

heard near a group of rocks on the north-east coast of Cape Ann, Massachusetts (Mr. Eliot explains that the Dry Salvages are presumably *les trois sauvages*).

The sea howl
And the sea yelp are different voices
Often together heard: the whine in the rigging,
The menace and caress of wave that breaks on water,
The distant rote in the granite teeth,
And the wailing warning from the approaching headland
Are all sea voices.

And along with the sea voices is the tolling bell which

Measures time not our time, rung by the unhurried
Ground swell, a time
Older than the time of chronometers, older
Than time counted by anxious worried women
Lying awake, calculating the future,
Trying to unweave, unwind, unravel
And piece together the past and the future,
Between midnight and dawn, when the past is all deception,
The future futureless, before the morning watch
When time stops and time is never ending.

How can we get beyond time to the timeless? In certain experiences the answer is—and if we cannot grasp their meaning now we may do this later.

But to apprehend
The point of intersection of the timeless
With time, is an occupation for the saint—
No occupation either, but something given
And taken, in a lifetime's death in love,
Ardour and selflessness and self-surrender.
For most of us, there is only the unattended
Moment, the moment in and out of time,
The distraction fit, lost in a shaft of sunlight,
The wild thyme unseen, or the winter lightning
Or the waterfall, or music heard so deeply
That it is not heard at all, but you are the music
While the music lasts. These are only hints and guesses,
Hints followed by guesses; and the rest
Is prayer, observance, discipline, thought and action.
The hint half guessed, the gift half understood, is Incarnation.

The publisher of Mr. T. S. Eliot is himself the author of the second volume—*The Buried Stream: Collected Poems, 1908–1940*, by Mr. Geoffrey Faber (Faber & Faber; 8s. 6d. net). So much of the best modern poetry has been published by Mr. Faber that, as he tells us in his long, interesting Preface on the new lines of development, he is proud to have been known as 'the godfather of modern English poetry.' He knows, no one better, what the modern school stands for. Yet in his own poetry he has not been able to go the full way with it. He has closer links with the earlier tradition. Amongst so much that is fine we turn especially to book two with its moving poems of the last war. He sees more than the horror of war and he never loses his faith.

I have the faith still though the vision fades.
The vision fades but I am sure of heaven.
There is a peace which tranquil forest glades
Own not; there is a glory which is given
Not to the kingdoms of this warring earth;
There is a beauty not of man or woman;
In all the highest that we bring to birth
There is an element which is not human.
And by whatever art, by what of skill
I can command, be this my utterance still.

The short day darkens. Troops and guns return.
The trumpet sounds out bravely in the street.
I must forget the past again, unlearn
My very nature, till the world smells sweet
Once more and I am free to go my way.
Then, Philip, I will set these random lines
Made for an index to my thoughts this day
Before my book; and they shall be for signs
That even in the midst of war I hold
The same faith that we two boys held of old.

The patriotic poems in the third volume, *Collected Poems, New and Old*, by Dr. Henry W. Clark (Williams & Norgate, 5s. net), unlike Mr. Faber's, are written entirely after the older manner.

Lord God, Thy throne is of old prepared
For arraignment and doom of wrong;
But when shall Thine arm in its might be bared
O'er those who but now foul war declared
Against Thee? Lord God, how long?

Thy name, Lord God, is our rallying-cry,
Ringing wide o'er the swaying field;
For sake of Thy name have we dared defy
The hordes who in scorn Thy name deny:
Lord God, be our sword and shield!

Until from forth Thy dread judgment-seat
Sounds in thunder Thy stern award—
Until the wild war-drums have ceased to beat—
Until the foe's flag shall own defeat—
Lord God, be our shield and sword!

It is perhaps in his longer soliloquies such as 'Cranmer' or 'Pilate' that Dr. Clark's imagination and eloquence show themselves most freely. But these poems do not lend themselves to short quotation. In both, the scene is set at the end of life, and the men look back and see their tragic mistakes and weaknesses.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.